

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE emergence of aggressive Fundamentalism in America has given fresh interest to the question as to the relations of Science to Religion. Several histories of the old conflict and several new discussions of the grounds of controversy have recently appeared. A thoroughly adequate résumé of the dispute is given in *The Church and Science*, by Hector MACPHERSON, M.A., Ph.D., in the 'Living Church' series (Clarke; 6s. net).

As may be gathered from the title, it deals with the action of ecclesiastical authorities and the utterances of representative churchmen, and it makes rather humiliating reading. It is not exhilarating to have it so clearly demonstrated how dogmatic, how ignorant, and how merciless were the judgments of the Church on questions of astronomy, geology, and biology, and looking back from our vantage-point in time to see how wrong-headed, indeed how faithless, their criticisms were. If such an historical survey could be widely circulated among the extreme Fundamentalists, one would hope that they might take warning. We are tempted, however, to take a rather wider view than the author, who has performed his own strictly defined task with such marked ability to our entire satisfaction.

In the conflict, Science *v.* The Church, Science has won, and most churchmen on this side the water acquiesce. Deeper things, however, are involved when we ask, how has it fared with religion, espe-

cially popular religion? Some glibly say, 'The marches are now cleared; there is no conflict; Religion and Science can go on each keeping to its own sphere, doing no manner of hurt the one to the other.' That is easily said, but is it quite true?

It is not true of the religion of the man in the street. To him religion is largely a way of getting things done. He prays if his need is fairly desperate. Now Science has come in as a sure way of getting things done. How get rid of malaria? Science answers, 'You *may* pray, but you *must* destroy the mosquitoes.' Hence, as an American Professor said recently, it is increasingly difficult to appreciate the need of God. Granted that such a view, regrettable in the mouth of a Professor, rests on a profound misunderstanding of religion and of God's place in the Universe, it is true that to the ordinary man it is not plain that prayer is so necessary or useful as he used to think it might be; nor is he so sure of God's activity.

Take the easiest illustration, petitionary prayer. That is quite definitely prayer for getting things done. Is it more sensible to pray for a change of weather than it would be to pray that to-morrow's sun might rise an hour earlier? If with Fosdick we are to rule out petitions about weather, what else are we to rule out? or rather, what petitions can we retain? Science discovers the sure way of getting things done, and to the truly religious

mind Science is God's revelation of how those particular things should be done. Is prayer, then, to become just a communing with God with self-surrender to His will, or is there still a place for petition? That is a problem, far from new indeed, but one to which modern science has given a sharpness and an obviousness which it never had before.

Again, we might show how difficult it is to get Science and Religion to keep to the separate compartments which the popular Apologist has assigned them, by recalling that there are sciences which deal with religion, its history and its psychology. It is the new psychology, with its anatomizing of the religious life, that is most disturbing to-day. In comparison with the vital questions now raised, the old controversy, Genesis *v.* Geology, is almost trivial. In the old conflict religion was defended by a masterly retreat from untenable positions involving the supposedly scientific teaching of a supposedly inerrant book, and a fortifying of what seemed the impregnable position of the inner testimony of the human spirit. But the whole nature, and in consequence the authority, of that inner spirit is now the subject of investigation, doubt, and controversy.

The conflict is not over, the possibility of conflict may never be got over. For our comfort let us ask what is happening as the result of it all. Not this, that we have had to surrender one element of religion after another till a vanishing-point is within sight. But this, that we are becoming increasingly aware of what precisely religion is, what Scripture is, and what is the real value of both; and increasingly confident that all the 'explanation' of ourselves and of the world which Science gives, or can ever hope to give, is not all the explanation which we need.

Recent times have seen the production of 'Lives' of Christ that have possessed features of special interest. Three especially are worthy of mention for a particular reason, Papini's 'Story of Christ,'

Middleton Murry's 'Life,' and the most recent of all, Dr. WARSCHAUER's *Historical Life* (reviewed in another column). The first was by a man of peculiar gifts, almost entirely ignorant of critical methods and results, but with a vision that set Jesus, as he saw Him, before us with extraordinary vividness. It was a work of remarkable genius. There has been nothing like it.

Mr. Murry's biography was the expression of a deep and almost worshipful admiration. It was the literary man's tribute to the greatness of Jesus. The writer was not quite so ignorant of criticism as Papini, but his knowledge might have been written down in a comparatively small space. And, as in the first case, more knowledge might have saved him from some of his worst mistakes. Dr. WARSCHAUER, again, sets out with a definite picture in his mind, that of the Christ who was an apocalypticist modified by spiritual intuitions. This writer is, unlike the others, a trained scholar, and his book has the marks of an expert all over it. But the point we wish to make is that it is also a book based on an idea.

Here we have three portraits of Jesus, that of an Italian Roman Catholic, that of a more or less agnostic literary man, and that of a rationalist with a theory. The Christ they depict for us is in each case different, because they find different things in Him. What Dr. WARSCHAUER says of the Virgin Birth stories—which he rejects—is true of all these 'Lives': 'What must have been the quality of a Life to which such an Origin was attributed? They are trustworthy testimonies, not to the reality of certain incidents, but to the quality and magnitude of Jesus' character.'

As a matter of fact, the same variety, within limits, is found in the New Testament. It is a mistake to imagine that there is only one picture of Christ in the New Testament. There are at least three. There is the Synoptic picture of the Jesus who went about doing good. Not a mere man, for the Gospels were written by those who believed in His Deity. But it is His humanity that is emphasized, and especially His human

love and interest in those who were needy. This is the source of all the representations of Jesus in modern art. It is a definite picture.

The Johannine picture is quite different. It is that of a supernatural Being. It is the Word made flesh, and it is always that. It is not suggested here that the Johannine picture is less true to the Reality, but just that it is different. John found something different in Jesus. It is a picture of the Son of God, and we are never allowed to forget His heavenly origin and heavenly nature. It is a different vision from that of the Synoptists.

Then there is the Pauline Christ, who is in some ways different from both the others. It is the crucified and risen Lord. The Cross is the centre of the Lord's life for Paul. How much he knew of the earthly life we do not know. He knew a great deal probably. But he ignored it largely. The earthly ministry for Paul was the Cross, and the Resurrection was largely the vindication of the Crucified. Christ was He who died for us and rose again. The Pauline Christ is a different vision, because Paul found this different thing in Christ.

As a fact we need the three visions or pictures to show us the One. We need the human ministry, the supernatural glory, and the Cross: they are all in Christ. It is surprising how one-sided our conception of Christ is apt to become. Take the conventional portrait of Jesus in art and in pictures in our schools and books for children. Is that the real Jesus? It cannot be. It is weak and effeminate. It may be the portrait of the Jesus who blessed children, but it is not the portrait of the Jesus who scourged the traffickers out of the Temple. It would be a good thing if this conventional and traditional portrait of Jesus could be got rid of.

How different is, e.g., the face of Jesus in Titian's 'Tribute Money.' A wonderful face, tender, gentle, thoughtful, but also strong and full of power. That is the real Jesus. We have to take the Jesus with a child in His arms and the Jesus with a scourge in His hands in the Temple if we are to see Him as He was. And perhaps that is the

real value of all these 'Lives' of Christ. They all have their own 'vision,' their own picture; and there is truth, some truth, in them all. And as we read them we must not allow our differences from them to blind us to the truth they embody. For we too may say, 'What must have been the quality of a life that draws so many eyes and in which so many souls find so much that is great.'

Alike over critics, historians, moralists, and the common people, the Decalogue exercises a perpetual fascination. The critic endeavours to discover its original form, the historian traces its influence through the history of the Hebrew people and through the subsequent history of Christianity, the moralist asks in what sense, if in any, it may be regarded as an epitome of human duty, while the common man regards it as the adequate and indestructible basis of all individual, social, and national life.

The unabated interest in the critical and historical study of it and in its applicability to modern life has been attested by several books that have recently appeared. Four years ago we had Archdeacon Charles's Warburton Lectures on the Decalogue, quite recently we had a monograph in French from the pen of Professor Gampert, on the 7th of last November Professor Meinhold chose the Decalogue as the subject of his rectorial address at the University of Bonn, and now the Rev. H. J. FLOWERS, B.A., B.D., brings before us *The Permanent Value of the Ten Commandments*, in a volume of 283 pages, published at 7s. 6d. net by Messrs. Allen & Unwin.

The French and German studies are mainly critical, and the uncertainty which besets Old Testament studies is seen in the widely divergent conclusions to which these scholars have come—Gampert championing the Mosaic, and Meinhold the exilic, origin of the Decalogue. Characteristically the English writers are interested in the practical value of the Decalogue, Mr. FLOWERS almost exclusively so, while Dr. Charles in his

discussion combines that interest with a thorough investigation of the critical problem. His words, indeed, are deeply significant of the pragmatic character of the English mind. 'Deeply as I have been interested,' he says, 'in the critical and historical study of the Decalogue, it has been my main aim to reinterpret the Decalogue on the spiritual and ethical lines already laid down in the New Testament, and to apply its lessons to the crying needs of our own day.'

Something like this is also the aim of Mr. FLOWERS' book, as its title would sufficiently indicate. Occasional touches show that he is not unfamiliar with the critical problems, but it is on the permanent value of the Decalogue that he has chosen to concentrate. Historical origin, as he truly says, is one thing, and inherent worth quite another. He knows that there is a danger of reading both too much and too little into the ten commandments, as into other great words of the Old Testament. He admits that 'there is no reason whatever for disputing that originally they meant what they said and very little more.' But he justly claims that we have the right to interpret them in the light that revelation and history have thrown upon them.

That is to say, for example, that the seventh commandment, which in itself only forbids adultery, may be taken, and in the light of Christian thought ought to be taken, as forbidding any and every kind of unchaste action and thought. And the ninth commandment, which, taken strictly, prohibits the giving of false evidence in the law courts, may be legitimately held to cover no less the prohibition of 'slander, calumny, detraction, blackmail, and misrepresentation of every sort.' We are the children of history; and the real meaning of the commandments is not only the meaning which the critical student of their origin may prove that they ultimately bore, but also the meaning which they have come to acquire for the enlightened Christian conscience.

A comprehensive study of the Decalogue like that of Mr. FLOWERS brings us face to face with many live modern problems, and the writer does

not miss his opportunity. The eighth commandment, *e.g.*, brings up the whole question of property. On this he has many sane and useful things to say. Regarding property as part of the Divine order through which men express and realize their personality, he offers some trenchant criticisms of communism as 'the politics of sentiment.' It is a system which has appealed not infrequently to the moral and religious thinker, but it has rarely commended itself to the professional economist, and it has no real support in the early Christian society described in Acts, for that was not built on the compulsory surrender of private possessions.

But it is worth while to point out, as Mr. FLOWERS does point out, that there are more thieves abroad than those who pick our pockets. Essentially a man is a thief who robs society of the service he is fitted and entitled to render, and essentially a man is not greatly better than a murderer and should be visited with drastic punishment, who adulterates food or drugs, thereby endangering the health of the community, and it may even be the lives of individuals, or who does or permits or authorizes or connives at the doing of scamped work, or the use of shoddy material, which may lead to fatal accidents. He refers to the law in the code of Hammurabi that, if a badly built house falls on the owner and kills him, the builder is put to death, and grimly adds, 'We could well copy the spirit of the Babylonian Law against jerry-building.'

The discussion of the second commandment leads Mr. FLOWERS into a searching analysis of image-worship. He knows all that can be said in favour of the crucifix as an aid to devotions and of the adoration of the Virgin and Child, and he deals with the arguments not unsympathetically; but he ends with a resolute rejection of all such practices. The constant contemplation of the crucifix at devotions tends to localize Christ, and, further, to concentrate attention on the wrong symbol of Christianity, the true symbol being not a cross, but a heavenly throne; while the adoration of the Virgin, besides undermining the purity of Christian worship and the uniqueness of Christ,

introduces an intermediary between man and God.

The writer's intensely Protestant convictions further come out in the statement that he regards 'with the utmost contempt and suspicion the constant attempts that are made to attach priestly functions to Nonconformist ministers.'

There are a few points at which we disagree both with Mr. FLOWERS' thought and with his language. We do not, for example, like to hear of God 'butting into' the plans of men, nor of His 'hammering certain facts home to them.' Nor are we quite sure that he puts the case well when he says that 'in order to witness to the worth of the family, Israel had to believe in the worthlessness of the

individual.' 'Relative unimportance' would surely have been nearer the truth than 'worthlessness.'

Nor is the following sentence beyond challenge: 'The wars of extirpation carried out against the Canaanites were in accordance with the command of God, and were in the nature of punishment upon the enemy for their cruelty and idolatry.' But what of the cruelty of these very extirpations? And what of the treatment of Adoni-bezek? The truth is that the Jahweh who was believed to have commanded these massacres was practically on the level of the Chemosh of the Moabite Stone. These, however, are but little points in a book that cannot fail to be full of suggestion to the preacher, and that deserves the eulogy of Dr. Moffatt which appears on the wrapper of the book.

The Parable of the Unjust Judge (Luke xviii. 1-8).

BY PROFESSOR J. A. ROBERTSON, D.D., UNITED FREE CHURCH COLLEGE, ABERDEEN.

THIS parable is a companion picture to that of the man outside a locked door at midnight trying to borrow three loaves to feed an unexpected guest (Lk 11⁵⁻⁸). They were probably originally spoken by Jesus at the same time, this one of the Unjust Judge following that of the Unfriendly Friend. Luke makes the story of the Unjust Judge follow a discourse on the Parousia, possibly because he found an apocalyptic conclusion attached to the parable, or because he got both from the same source—had listened to some Christian preacher, an early follower of Jesus, some prophetic voice, Silas or some other, discoursing on our Lord's predictions of the end. Certainly the closing verses do sound like some Christian prophet's attempt to press home the moral of the story.

But the kinship with the parable of the Unfriendly Friend is unmistakable. In both we find a needy suppliant and a reluctant bestower; in both there is a touch of the Master's humour; and both end with a complete breakdown of the reluctance. Here, however, in the parable of the Unjust Judge all the lines and shadows are hardened and intensified. In the earlier parable we are listening to a friend begging from a friend on a friend's behalf. In this case we are listening to a Jewish widow,

one of the most helpless and unprotected creatures on God's earth, petitioning a callous beast, who happened to be the city's judge, for justice against some wolf of a man who was taking a cruel advantage of her unprotectedness. We are away from the circle of human friendship, out amid the cold and blighting winds of enmity. The widow had no bribe to offer the judge, and he had no sense of justice and apparently none of the milk of human kindness about him.

It is one's own impression that both these stories are founded on experiences which Jesus Himself had shared. They are memory echoes of the early days in Nazareth. In the one there is the family atmosphere of protection and freedom from care which Mary shared with her children, while the hard-working, conscientious husband Joseph was alive. The other is perhaps the guarded memory of the blackest hour in the long grim days when the widow and her eldest-born, without protection now, exposed to all the bitter and relentless winds of man's inhumanity to man, toiled and struggled to keep the little home together. How often is that word 'widow' upon Jesus' lips! And was the enemy of that Nazareth home perchance some pious money-grubbing Pharisee, who devoured

widows' houses, trying to sell the house over her head to get what was not his own?

A widow! The word conjures up before our Western eyes a vision of the long, black, trailing weeds of sorrow. In many an instance, and certainly in this case, it brings to mind also a story of poverty and need. Darkest shadow of all—the very fact that this widow stands before a minister of law, clamouring for justice, means that she is a hunted, wounded thing, hard-pressed and cruelly wronged. Sorrow, care, need, unprotectedness, the 'sense of wrong and outrage desperate'—these are the conditions out of which this anguished prayer springs.

But before passing away from the comparison of the two parables, let us think for a moment further of the two men to whom the prayers for help were directed. In the earlier case we listen with an amused smile to the lame excuses of laziness for a refusal that is certainly going to break down. Are they not the things that a man in the ill-humour of being half awake would say? 'The door is already barred'—as if it were any harder to unbar at midnight than at daybreak; 'and my children are with me in bed'—as though he were unwilling to disturb or waken them, and yet he was shouting through the room to a man outside the door: 'one little pair of ears at least were alert and listening in Nazareth. Such is the Master's touch of humour in this parable. But in the other case we hear no uttered word of refusal. We are called on to contemplate that most dreadful of all refusals—silence. In the stillness of that house of law, we seem to see the judge with lowering brows listen for one impatient moment to the querulous, tearful entreaty. And then with a shrug of the shoulders and a lifting of the eyebrows in annoyance and disdain, he deliberately turns his back upon the insignificant suppliant, and with brutal rudeness stalks away. And though we wait long in that silent chamber, though we watch the poor petitioner come again and yet again with ever loud and louder outcries, still the same answer, the awful refusal of the stony silence that breaks the heart and turns it too to stone.

It is a fiercely drawn picture of a certain mood in prayer. It reminds us of some of the ancient Hebrew Psalms. 'How long wilt thou forget me, O Lord? For ever? How long wilt thou hide thy face from me? How long shall I take counsel in my soul, having sorrow in my heart daily? How long shall mine enemy be exalted over me? Consider and hear me, O Lord my God: lighten mine eyes lest I sleep the sleep of death: lest mine

enemy say, I have prevailed against him; and those that trouble me rejoice when I am moved.' It is the mood that sometimes comes when men have been standing in the great audience-chamber of the Universe, and their eyes are too dim with sorrow, too dark with the tragedy of a broken world, to discern the figure of the Judge upon the bench; and out of the great, blank, empty silence only the echo of their own cries seems to come back to mock them. It is to this mood the Master addresses Himself here. And His counsel is to keep on praying. The purpose of the parable is, in the words of the Evangelist's editorial comment at the beginning of the story, to urge 'that men ought always to pray, and not to faint.' For, according to Jesus, such persistent prayer sooner or later is crowned with success. We must note at the outset how He makes His story end. The widow's prayer was granted, at last. Even in this desperate and seemingly hopeless case, where all the facts were dead against the petitioner, the prayer was granted—because she persevered.

In those old headings to the chapters in our King James' version, this parable has been named 'the importunate widow.' And it is a right human instinct that has named it so. For the story is meant to teach the value of importunity, the real spiritual efficacy of a kind of sanctified presumptuousness in prayer. The widow has been accused, indeed, of impudence, because she did not take time to use a flowery circumlocution, because she did not address the gentleman on the bench with proper ceremony, and call him, 'My Lord.' But real distress knows no ceremony. It goes straight to the point. And it persists in coming back to the point, again and again. She had got long past the stage of proffering a humble request. She had got beyond even the stage of urgent entreaty. Her prayer had grown to be a loud complaint which was almost an imprecation. We may not write her down perhaps as an angry fury; but she was at least a little, piteous, hustling storm of wind and rain, which kept repeating itself. The Divine Artist has made it very clear that she was out to pester and annoy the man, to compel him to take action in spite of himself. And, startling though it may appear, it is precisely this quality in her prayer that Jesus is commending to our earnest attention. The conclusion to which we are forced back in the end is that of the virtue, the usefulness, nay, the success of importunity in prayer.

'Hear what the unrighteous judge saith,' the Master bids us. We now turn, therefore, to take close scrutiny of the judge's words. And as we look

at them, the petty selfishness of them, the frank and sordid meanness, the cynicism, the blasphemy, we are forced to remind ourselves that Christ is drawing no comparison between this judge and God. He *is* thinking no doubt of God as a Judge, an honourable and upright Judge in a universe governed by laws of strict justice. And it is no unworthy title to apply to God. A judge is set to be the guardian of law and order, a terror to evil-doers, the protector of the injured and the wronged. And we recall the fact that an old Hebrew poet, in a hymn of adoration (Ps. 68), can find no nobler name to praise God by: 'A Father of the fatherless, a Judge of the widows is God in his holy habitation.' A Judge of the widows! But this man in the parable had mistaken his vocation: a judge that was no judge.

And let us, at Jesus' bidding, listen to his soliloquy (Luke is fond of recording soliloquies: witness his parables of the Rich Fool, the Prodigal Son, and the Vineyard Owner). Let us listen to the dreadful character he gives himself: 'I fear not God, neither regard man . . . this woman annoys me.' An atheist, whose denial of the fear of God indicates the extreme degree of religious and moral corruption. A cynical misanthrope, quite shameless in the face of his fellows. An egotist, concerned only about his own selfish ease and comfort. Self—that was the source and spring of all the motives by which his life seemed to be guided. He felt it would be a toil to set the apparatus of justice in motion, and he would gain nothing in his own interests. And we are just about to turn away from the ugly picture with a feeling of utter hopelessness, when the Master pulls us up again: 'I beg you to hear what the unjust judge says.' We must have missed something. Then a light begins to dawn, and we follow the gleam till at the end we are constrained to break into a ripple of laughter. Let us listen again to him. The man is talking to himself. Short, gruff, laconic phrases he is muttering. A lonely, crusty old man. And ever that hoarse croak falls on the ear: 'God! What do I care for God? Mankind! I have no interest in mankind.' And just at that moment the door is pushed open, and immediately there is a shrill, strident voice: 'Redress, redress! Free me from the clutches of my enemy! Legal satisfaction! Justice, justice!' And there is a movement in the room, and the old harsh voice growing louder and harsher: 'Dear me! is that the woman again? Will I never get rid of her? Why won't she leave me alone?'

When men tell us that our Lord never made use of the high gift of humour, we are driven back to

this story among others, and it will not let us pass without a smile. 'Hear what the unjust judge saith.' Closely scan the closing words of his soliloquy. 'This widow troubles me'—what a nuisance she is! 'I will avenge her'—I had better settle her case. 'Lest by her continual coming she weary me' (so our Authorized Version renders the clause). Almost literally the Greek means, 'in case, coming back and back, at last she strike me black and blue in the face.' Lest she get more and more persistent, and end by giving me two black eyes.

And with these words we seem to catch sight of the man, and are just in time to see the last fleeting gleam of a smile on his usually stern, forbidding face. In that whimsical gleam of ironical self-pity the man stands before us self-betrayed. All that stern outward aspect, all that bullying bluster, all that fiercely muttered soliloquy are just a mask, an assumed mask which he has all but succeeded in persuading himself to be his real self. A Mephistopheles disguised in human form he seems to regard himself. 'You have no idea what a terrible fellow I am,' he seems to say. 'I am a cynic, utterly regardless of mankind.' And with bulging eyes, as if he would fain make our flesh creep, he whispers huskily, 'I am an atheist.' It is really a sham, even though he may have persuaded himself he is quite in earnest.

And that brings us to the heart of the meaning of this parable. It was the woman's importunity, her brazen refusal to be put off with the cold shoulder, that broke down the mask at last. The woman refused to believe that there was not a spark of humanity lying hidden somewhere still in the man's apparently selfish heart. And she was right. It was more than mere outward annoyance. There was a little prick of conscience disturbing the man's inward peace as well. A thoroughly selfish being would only have found a malicious amusement in the woman's daily tears and cries.

But importunity of this sort in prayer? we are fain here to ask. Is it not an unseemly attitude of mind? And Christ answers, reluctance to beg even of your fellow-men for some good cause means suspicion on your part. It means that you are unwilling to give the uncertain friendliness of the world the benefit of the doubt. Of course he who is not ashamed to beg hard for some good object *is* presumptuous. He presumes upon the essential goodness of mankind. But surely that is, in itself, a noble thing. It is exercising faith in human friendliness, in the brotherhood of man. And as a matter of fact this confiding urgency of appeal to

men, while it may meet with an occasional rebuff, is in the main rewarded. Men are surprised into a smiling generosity by the persistent beggar. They are agreeably amused at him, because he is paying them a very high compliment. And in trying to persuade them that they are more generous men than they think they are, he wakens the better self in them.

But the point of the parable is, How does the case stand when we apply all this to God? Dare we be forward and importunate with Him? Does it not seem to be the very thing the Master is bidding His followers here to be? His argument is that it would be the height of unfaith, not to presume—not to form the presumption—that God is essentially and altogether good. His argument is a *minori ad maius*. How much more ought we to exercise importunity with God than with men. When there is no importunity in prayer to God, no persistent sincerity of desire, Christ seems to say, men are guilty of a terrible suspicion about God. They are listening, with the ear of the soul awake, in the long unbroken silence of the Justice-chamber of the Universe, and they are allowing dark shadows of suspicion to gather in their hearts. Then they are projecting those shadows out into the void: they are imagining that God is altogether like this sour, warped soul, this misanthropic, selfish judge. That is what Christ drew in this parable—not *His* picture of God, but man's, with his suspicion, his lack of faith.

The apparently sinister indifference of the world of Nature with its iron laws, man sometimes thinks, is God saying to him: 'I am an austere, hard person; do not come plaguing me with your prayers.' It is the nonsense of unfaith to think so, Jesus says. The Eternal Will is set constantly in the direction of His people's highest good. As long as men imagine otherwise, they are bound to faint and grow slack in prayer. And so long as they do that, they fail to provide the very condition and opportunity in which the kindest and most generous Heart in all the Universe can break through the hard mask of Nature, or rather men's illusions

about Nature, to answer their prayers. Importunity toward God is the sublime refusal to believe that God is anything else but fatherly, in spite of all appearances to the contrary. Humble importunity toward God in prayer is childlike faith in the eternal and inexhaustible fatherliness of God. God is the infinite Father, holy and just in all His ways, teaching His children to ask. He withholds His best gifts until we learn to ask with sincerity. He withholds the holiest desires of our heart until we learn to ask for them with all our heart. Because only so shall we be fitted to receive them. The gates of the Kingdom of Everlasting Satisfaction are only to be unlocked by real prayer. And only the strongest and most persistent prayer can turn the key that opens the door into the treasure-house of God's most precious jewels. For it is to be remembered that the barriers against entrance to that heavenly treasure-house are man-made barriers. The Christ of glory bends with yearning agony over the world to-day, but all the surge of His mighty healing spirit will be lost in the quicksands of hate and despair unless men open a way for it by their prayers.

The closing verses, reflecting the consciousness of the early Church, are difficult to interpret, especially that despairing sigh with which the parable in its present form ends: 'Nevertheless, when the Son of man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth?' Perhaps, as Dr. A. T. Cadoux has pointed out, these verses represent a mistranslation from the Aramaic, and should be read: 'I tell you, he would avenge them speedily; but then would the Son of man, when He comes, find faith on the earth?' God's delays are a condition for the growth of faith. That would bring the present ending into line with the teaching of the parable. 'God does feel the wrongs of humanity—is long-suffering over them' (a probable gloss in the text)—'and will stop the injustice as soon as possible, but if He does so immediately, what possibility would faith have of making good its place in the world? . . . If God permitted no undeserved suffering in His world, faith in goodness, and, with it, all spiritual triumph, would be impossible.'

Literature.

A NEW LIFE OF CHRIST.

DR. J. WARSCHAUER, favourably known for previous contributions to theology, has now produced what must be described as his *magnum opus*: *The Historical Life of Christ* (Unwin; 15s. net). He admits frankly that of these lives there has been, and promises to be, no end. But his apologia for adding another is reasonable enough. His is from a new standpoint. It is an *Apocalyptic* life of Christ. He has set himself to apply the theory of Schweitzer to the ministry of Jesus in detail. And he has, in any case, produced a very readable book, marked by two things which predispose any one favourably. First, he has mastered the literature, and at every point shows himself a competent investigator. And, further, he has the indispensable qualification for any one who writes on this theme, a profound reverence for Christ. Indeed, his language, when he speaks of our Lord, is so emphatic in its profession of reverent faith that one constantly wonders in reading the book where he finds the basis for this faith.

Needless to say, the 'life' is entirely modern. It is modern in its rejection of miracle. But it would seem as if the writers who refuse the miraculous do stand in need sometimes of a sense of humour. In writing of the Stilling of the Tempest, for example, Dr. Warschauer suggests that Jesus was none too gently roused from sleep, and, seeing the disciples in wild excitement, shouting and wailing, He addressed His rebuke, not an idyllic 'Peace, be still!' but a sharp 'Silence, get muzzled!' to the ringleader of the noise and not to the tempest. 'And the wind ceased, and there was a great calm,' and Dr. Warschauer adds, 'A coincidence, indeed, but life is full of coincidences.' Would not a slight sense of humour have saved him from this?

We hasten to say that the book is not on this level at all. It has a serious contribution to make, and its contribution, briefly, is that Jesus began His ministry sharing the apocalyptic views of His age. He seems to have retained this standpoint all through as a kind of framework. But the author feels constrained to admit what largely vitiates his main contention, that Jesus filled this framework with a teaching that was purely spiritual and timeless. Along with his main point the author holds (what indeed follows) that Jesus, when He spoke of the Son of Man, did not mean Himself. He used

the third person because He referred to a third person. We seem frequently to come in sight of Mr. Middleton Murry's bizarre idea that Jesus thought He was to *become* the Son of Man after His death.

The fact on which theories of this kind wreck themselves is the narrative of the Temptation. It seems obvious that the essence of the Temptation was just the conflict in the Lord's mind between the traditional view of what Messiah was to be and do, and His own higher vision of God's will. What is the meaning of the Devil's suggestion on 'the high mountain'? The story implies that Jesus fought His fight there and won. He came out with the traditional view of Messiah's function firmly rejected. There is nothing in this elaborate discussion by Dr. Warschauer that can stand against that. And if anything in the Gospels is genuine, surely this story, which must have come from Jesus Himself, is so. Dr. Warschauer suggests that the Temptation narrative has been modified. But that is too easy. It is surely the 'last ditch' when such a passage is dealt with in this way.

We find ourselves in conflict with the writer at many points, especially when he is original, as in his account of the Lord's Baptism. The handling of the Resurrection narrative is too drastic, and the explanation of the despair of the disciples after the Crucifixion is as inadequate as that of others. He suggests that Christ's predictions of His Resurrection were not so definite as the records show. This lets the disciples down gently, too gently. Is it not simpler and truer to point to a fact which every preacher has found to his dismay, that when you declare to people a truth which is novel or unpalatable, they simply do not take it in? It is an amazing fact, but it is perfectly familiar. Dr. Warschauer adheres to the Vision hypothesis in his treatment of the Resurrection stories, and it appears very bald and unconvincing in his hands. But he himself evidently believes in a living Christ, on the ground of experience. This is all to the good, but he does not leave much history behind the experience.

This book is an able and thorough piece of work. It is too rationalistic to present a true picture of the Christ of faith. But every one who worships Jesus as this writer does will paint his picture of Him. And perhaps they are all needed to help us to the final truth.

PROFESSOR MCFADYEN ON THE
OLD TESTAMENT.

The well-known Professor of Old Testament Studies in Glasgow United Free Church College has followed up his admirable 'Approach to the Old Testament' with another equally admirable and even more valuable: *A Guide to the Understanding of the Old Testament*, by John Edgar McFadyen, D.D. (James Clarke; 5s. net). This book is based on articles which were contributed to a church magazine in Scotland, and which were designed to give the plain man an understanding of the principles and results of the Higher Criticism as this has been applied to the Old Testament literature. No one could do this better than Dr. McFadyen, and in point of fact the articles were so good that many of their original readers must have clamoured for their appearance in a permanent form. Dr. McFadyen is so conscientious a scholar that he puts his best into everything he does. And no one could wish for a better statement of what criticism makes of the Old Testament than he will get here. It is fair, candid, thorough, cautious. We do not know any book which in brief compass contains so much that is enlightening and satisfying. It is satisfying because with all his modernity Dr. McFadyen is a loyal and convinced believer, and he takes occasion not only to criticize but to appreciate, and to point out the real basis on which he, with other believing critics, receives the Bible as the Word of God.

There is indeed a great deal more in this book than has been indicated. The first section contains chapters which deal with the Bible generally, expounding its beauty, its variety, its uniqueness, with an enthusiasm which is catching. And the volume concludes with a section in which the religious worth of the Bible is illustrated in a series of delightful studies of Amos, Jeremiah, and the Psalms, with some others.

It is a real pleasure to be able to praise so highly the work of a scholar who has done so much to help ministers, teachers, and other students to understand the greatness of the Bible. He has made the Old Testament a new book to many, and he has done so because he loves it, and because he combines with a great scholar's adequacy a wonderful gift of lucid and simple exposition.

RICHARD BAXTER.

Dr. F. J. Powicke has completed his learned and scholarly biography of Baxter. The first volume,

A Life of the Reverend Richard Baxter, left off at his marriage to Margaret Charlton, 'who bravely stepped out with him into the dark days which she knew were coming.' The second volume is entitled *The Reverend Richard Baxter under the Cross* (1662-1691) (Cape; 15s. net), and records how he suffered and behaved under the cross of being ejected and silenced—silenced by the Church he loved so well. A secondary aim of the volume is to show how much he owed to Margaret Charlton in the nineteen years they were together. The work is the fruit of industrious research, and is carefully documented; and it offers new material, furnished mostly by the Baxter MSS., for the completion of the picture drawn by Calamy, Orme, and later writers.

In Dr. Powicke's sympathetic study the point is clearly made that Baxter was no hard-shell scripturalist and puritan. He was a 'Meer Nonconformist'—that is, as little of a Nonconformist as he could be. As such he is to be recognized as a prophet of moderation, seeking to hold the balance between the Prelatist on the one hand and the Separatist on the other, and clinging to the hope of a united Protestant England, of one English Church broad-based on simple Christianity.

In the interesting chapter entitled 'Baxterianism,' Dr. Powicke readily finds, as one might expect of an author who gave us last year an informing study of the Cambridge Platonists, a pronounced affinity between Baxter and writers like Whichcote and John Smith in the matter of their attitude to natural theology: 'he looked at the heavens not merely through the words of the 19th Psalm, but with the very heart of the Psalmist.'

The concluding chapter offers an appreciation of Baxter. 'Overdoing is undoing' was a maxim often on his lips, but he should have laid it to his own heart. Yet his 'overdoing' was but an error of judgment, springing from excessive anxiety to make out his case. Over against this and his explosiveness of temper must be set his single-mindedness, his moral elevation, and his spirit of love.

SIR OLIVER LODGE'S MESSAGE.

A new Trust has been created, called the Halley Stewart Trust, from the name of its founder and endower. The object is quite wide enough to include all efforts towards the amelioration of the species. Sir Oliver Lodge is the first person entrusted with the carrying out of its objects, and the course of lectures which he delivered in London in fulfilment of his commission has just been published under the title *Science and Human*

Progress (Allen & Unwin ; 4s. 6d. net). The lectures excited very keen interest when they were given, and we do not wonder. They are literally fascinating. This will be understood when it is said that they include much information on scientific subjects of an engrossing nature, reflections on the relation of science and religion, and on the bearing of science upon social problems, and finally a good deal of careful discussion of the destiny of the soul after death.

It would be impossible to refer in detail to the large number of topics thus embraced. But on the religious question Sir Oliver's statements are so remarkable that one or two may be quoted. 'If any one is able to contemplate the Universe in all its magnificence and interlocked beauty and variety, and come to the conclusion that nothing higher than mankind exists in it, I cannot envy him his common sense. The Universe is shoutingly full of design, plan, intention, purpose, reason, and what has been called Logos. Not only the heavens, but the earth ; not only the flowers, mountains, sunsets, but every pebble, every grain of dust, the beautiful structure of every atom, proclaim the glory of the Being Who planned and understands it all.'

With regard to miracle, take this : ' In particular, and as an example of what I mean, if I trespass off my ground and on to the ground of the Theologians, I want to say that, as far as I can judge, the progress of science is tending towards a strengthening of Theology in all its really vital aspects ; and that certain narrations which have been doubted—I shall be understood by many here if I cite as examples the direct voice at the Baptism, the Presences at the Transfiguration, the Vision on the road to Damascus—were true happenings. True, that is, not merely because of historical evidence, about which many are better judges than I, but because things like these *can* happen. And I look to the time when the constant interaction of spirit and matter will be more fully recognized ; when the term " spirit " will be extended to human spirit, and the Incarnation can be rationally recognized as both a Divine and a human fact.'

These are remarkable utterances from such a source. They will whet the appetite of readers for more. And we can safely promise these readers that they will not be disappointed.

SENNACHERIB'S INVASION OF PALESTINE.

A thoroughly valuable and necessary piece of work in connexion with *Sennacherib's Invasion of*

Palestine has been done by Mr. Leo L. Honor, Ph.D., in a book bearing this title and published by Mr. Milford (Oxford University Press ; 9s. net). He points out that much that has hitherto passed for history is really hypothesis, and he gives seven hypothetical reconstructions of the invasion, or invasions, of Sennacherib ; for that is one of the problems—was there one or two ? The value of Dr. Honor's discussion is that he presents all the available ancient evidence, both from Assyrian and Biblical sources (Kings, Chronicles, and Isaiah) and discusses it in a thoroughly objective and impartial spirit. Much of it is notoriously difficult to correlate, *e.g.* the pro-Assyrian and the anti-Assyrian prophecies of Isaiah, and it is a great advantage to have this calm, dispassionate conspectus of the facts. Most people like definite results ; the value of this book is that it reveals all too plainly the impossibility in many cases of reaching final conclusions on the basis of the evidence at our disposal, and the sheer folly of dogmatism. Of the seven hypotheses mentioned above, Dr. Honor assures us that no one is better substantiated by the available facts than any other, and that all our conclusions must remain hypothetical until some new evidence comes to light.

THE EXTRA-CANONICAL NEW TESTAMENT.

Some of the early Christian literature, now excluded from the New Testament, has been gathered together, and is published under the dubious title *Excluded Books of the New Testament*, with an Introduction by Dr. J. Armitage Robinson (Nash & Grayson ; 7s. 6d. net). The title suggests, as Dr. Robinson says, that the books here issued were at one time regarded as part of the New Testament and were afterwards ejected on various grounds by a council of divines, which finally settled the Canon. This is, of course, not the case. The Canon 'grewed,' like Topsy, and was selected by the faith and experience of the believers. And the books included in this volume excluded themselves. No one did it for them. All the same, it would be difficult to suggest a better title. Try it. Our own title is not very pretty.

Nevertheless, the books are immensely interesting and valuable from different points of view. They fall into two groups. First there are the Apocryphal books in the modern sense, 'The Book of James,' 'The Gospel of Nicodemus,' 'The Gospel of Peter,' and 'The Revelation of Peter'—all very revealing as to the state of mind of the early Church when

its members were cut off from heathen poetry and heathen enjoyments and found compensation in marvellous stories of Jesus and His apostles. Then there is a group of writings of strictly historical value, the Epistle of Clement, the so-called 'Second Epistle of Clement,' which is a homily of anonymous authorship, a passionate treatise called 'The Epistle of Barnabas,' also in reality anonymous, and the famous 'Shepherd of Hermas,' an early book of parables and visions that reveals much of the social side of Christian society in Rome.

These books are prefaced by an extraordinarily interesting introduction by Dr. Robinson which contains *multum in parvo* and is entirely sufficient for its purpose. The Translations are by Bishop Lightfoot, Dr. M. R. James, the Provost of Eton, and Dr. H. B. Swete. We must spare a word of praise for the beautiful dress given to this publication. The printing and the binding are unusually fine.

THE NEW PRAYER BOOK.

The Bishop of Gloucester, Dr. A. C. Headlam, has followed up his great 'charge,' which was recently published under the title of 'The Church of England,' by a very timely charge delivered to the clergy and churchwardens of the diocese on *The New Prayer Book* (Murray; 2s. 6d. net). The Prayer Book which has been in use hitherto is to all intents and purposes nearly 400 years old. That seems to many people a sound reason why it should be left alone. But the Bishop devotes himself to showing good reason for some change. As a matter of fact hardly any one uses the Prayer Book just as it is, and this introduces his first reason, that the Prayer Book should conform to existing usage. The second is that certain things in the Prayer Book which do not harmonize with the habits and thoughts of the day should be modified. Thirdly, we want to enrich the Prayer Book. Fourthly, many people demand that the Prayer Book should be adapted to the conditions of modern thought. Fifthly, there is a desire for more colour or ceremonial in the services. Sixthly, a Prayer Book should be such that the law of the Church would be enforced. These reasons are expounded with ample illustration and in a careful and considerate manner which is calculated to modify acid tempers. The changes are then gone over in detail, and an appeal is made for honest and candid consideration. We can hardly imagine any treatment of this intensely controversial subject more likely to produce an attitude of reasonable-

ness. Dr. Headlam is known to be not only a scholar of great eminence, but a man of rare balance and moderation. These are notable qualities in a bishop and are just the qualities that are likely to make such an appeal as his successful.

We cannot have too many books of apologetic if they are good. And to be good they must be alive to modern needs and modern ways of thinking; they must be candid; they must be written with the pen of experience. *What may I Believe?* is the challenging title of a book of this kind, by Edmund D. Soper, and published by the Abingdon Press in New York (\$1.50). No one can read this excellent series of discussions without being impressed by the author's sincerity, his knowledge of the doubting mind and of the points at which perplexity presses, and his firm grasp of essential truth. In our opinion, he gives away a little too much, e.g., in discussing the value of the 'proofs' for the existence of God. But that only increases our confidence in his honesty. The questions he deals with include all that a young man at the doubting stage would ask. How may I know there is a God? Is the Bible God's Word? What is a miracle, and do miracles happen? How much more than a man was Jesus Christ? Is man the master of his fate? What becomes of a man when he dies? Why do men pray? Is Christianity the final religion? These are only examples out of the twenty-five titles. And it may safely be said that any one who puts himself in the hands of this guide will receive help of the most vital nature. This is a book that deserves warm commendation.

The title of a collection of sermons by the Rev. Charles E. Schofield shows the author's purpose and sounds the note which runs through all the sermons. It is *The Gospel of Opportunity* (Abingdon Press; \$1.25). In an age of pessimism Mr. Schofield presents afresh the Gospel of Jesus with its undreamed-of possibilities of transforming the whole of human life. This central idea is perhaps most clearly worked out in a sermon on the Expanding Life, the gist of which may be read in 'The Christian Year.'

All that Professor Bosanquet wrote for the Press is worth not only reading but preservation. It is, therefore, not only a pious but a meritorious service which his representatives have performed in collecting his fugitive papers, *Science and Philosophy, and*

Other Essays, by the late Bernard Bosanquet (Allen & Unwin; 16s. net). The papers, twenty-four in number, are roughly classified under the headings Logic and Metaphysics; Ethical, Social, and Political; and Æsthetics. Every individual essay is of value, full of suggestion and stimulus, and all with a distinctive literary grace and finish.

Mr. Bertram Colgrave, Lecturer in English in the University of Durham, has given us a scholarly edition of *The Life of Bishop Wilfrid by Eddius Stephanus* (Cambridge University Press; 12s. 6d. net), a work which, with the exception of the Anonymous Life of St. Cuthbert, and Bede's Metrical Life of the same saint, is the earliest piece of biography in our literature. Written probably between 710 and 720 A.D., it offers a contemporary picture, if undoubtedly idealized, and bedecked with a spurious garland of miracle, of a man who was a great figure in the political and ecclesiastical life of England in the seventh century.

Mr. Colgrave rightly claims that there is a real need for a fresh text of Eddius. This he has supplied, with careful notes of the most important variants in the two extant manuscripts of the Life. He has also supplied an 'unpretentious' but accurate and readable translation of the Latin text, and helpful explanatory notes on the various chapters. It is a pleasure to handle a work so scholarly, and we hope that Mr. Colgrave will follow it up with that separate study of St. Wilfrid's life and character which he has in view. It would be useful and interesting to set, if possible, the picture drawn by Eddius against its true historical background.

Professor Watt, of New College, Edinburgh, with some reluctance undertook to exhibit the particular problems which have faced the Church in each of her twenty centuries, by writing an account of a Churchman representative of each. His reluctance is understandable, for it is an almost bizarre task. History does not recognize the division of her own course into centuries, however useful the convention be for us. The task of selecting just one individual as representative of the manifold developments of centuries like the eighteenth or nineteenth is obviously one which no two human beings would be likely to solve in the same way.

Apart from the conception of the book, for which the author is not responsible, the workmanship deserves the highest praise. As a brief but 'meaty' account of nineteen men, all noteworthy figures in Church history, we have seen nothing so admirable.

There was no room allowed for footnotes or references, but the statements represent the considered judgment of a scholar whose knowledge is full, and whose historical insight may be thoroughly trusted. The book is entitled *Representative Churchmen of Twenty Centuries*, by Professor Hugh Watt, D.D. (James Clarke; 6s. net); and the men selected are Paul, Justin Martyr, Cyprian, Constantine, Augustine, Columbanus, Gregory, Boniface, Charlemagne, Odo of Cluny, Hildebrand, Bernard of Clairvaux, Francis of Assisi, Wyclif, Gerson, Luther, Henderson, Wesley, and Livingstone.

The Statesmanship of Jesus, by the Rev. W. P. Goard, F.R.G.S. (The Covenant Publishing Co.; 3s. 6d. net), is declared in the subtitle to be 'A Study in the Wonderful Epistle to the Hebrews.' It cannot with any degree of accuracy be so designated. The exposition certainly follows the course of the Epistle, but little attempt is made at patient study and faithful interpretation. On the contrary, the writer's own peculiar views are thrust upon the text, and in particular it is tortured to bear testimony to the strange doctrines of British-Israelism.

The insular complacency of John Bull is a plant of renown, but the climatic conditions since the War have not been altogether favourable to its growth. We are learning, slowly and painfully perhaps, that we differ from other nations as much as they differ from us, that our standards of judgment are relative, and that other races may have not only different viewpoints, but even different mentalities. These lessons are strikingly illustrated and enforced in *China and Britain*, by Mr. R. O. Hall (Edinburgh House Press; 2s. net). The appearance of this book is timely and it ought to be read by everybody who is interested in China. It is written with conspicuous impartiality, with full appreciation of the difficulties which beset the relations of Britain and China, and with a deep desire to promote international brotherhood.

Mr. Robert Brymer vouches for the truth of the twelve stories which he tells in *Uncut Jewels* (Harrap; 3s. 6d. net). They are of lads who have come under his own personal care while he was engaged in mission work. Perhaps the strangest of all is 'Jim.' He was a thief, and after being saved from prison time after time by his friends, is at last left undergoing detention under a kind of modified Borstal system. Here is an extract from Jim's last letter: 'It's a long time

ago since I wrote to you or you to me. No doubt, now, you think I am not worth the trouble. Life here leaves a lot to be desired, as you can imagine. At present the ground is quite six inches in mud. This fact alone tends to make not only my temper rotten, but many others'.

'You have interested yourself in the class of boy that is here, namely, the poor-law class, and have found good in them. After nine months' residence here I cannot find one redeeming feature about them. It's the greatest eye-opener in the world to stop at a place like this. In my opinion there is a far more deserving class of people need help. To keep these people, who breed like wild animals, is sheer waste of taxpayers' money.

'I captain our football team, and I'm looking forward to the summer, when cricket arrives. Give my kind regards to all at the Brotherhood who were acquainted with me, also to Mrs. Brown. I should like to hear from you soon.' Mr. Brymer's comment is, 'Here faith and prayer have been sorely tried.'

A Book of Modern Prayers: A Collection of Prayers and Readings by Modern Writers, with an Introductory Essay on the Meaning and Value of Prayer, has been prepared by the Rev. Samuel McComb, D.D., and published by Messrs. Longmans (6s. net). The editor has not been content with well-known and easily accessible prayers. He has ranged widely from Cardinal Newman to Henry Ward Beecher, from Robert Louis Stevenson to Benjamin Jowett and George Matheson. The volume contains about sixty prayers, which are arranged under broad subject headings.

The Life of Thomas Cranmer, by Canon Anthony C. Deane, M.A., F.R.S.L. (6s. net), is the first of the 'Great English Churchmen' Series, edited by Mr. Sidney Dark of the 'Church Times,' and published by Messrs. Macmillan. The series, which is intended to show the significance of the man in the age in which he lived, makes a most excellent beginning. Canon Deane has succeeded in writing an attractive book. It is on popular lines, and the style is as popular as it is pointed. His estimate of Archbishop Cranmer seems to us to be very just; and the setting of time and place is portrayed with admirable clarity. Particularly successful is the description of the relations between the greedy and immoral despot and his credulous, pliant, and subservient tool. We are told that the general editorial policy is to select a biographer sympathetic with the character with whom he deals. In the study

before us Canon Deane certainly shows understanding of Cranmer's mind and temperament, but that does not prevent him from dealing faithfully with Cranmer. He would 'mingle pity for the timid servant of a tyrant king with unflinching censure of an Archbishop who betrayed his Church.' 'Few good men,' he adds, 'have done so many bad things.' Undoubtedly it would have taken a man of courage, conviction, and resolution to lead the English Church in the days of Henry VIII., and Cranmer was not such a man. His lamentable failure in leadership may only be excused on the ground that he was transferred against his will from Cambridge to Lambeth; and it was only redeemed in the last act of his unhappy career when he thrust his right hand into the rising flame, crying, 'This hand hath offended!' Yet after all, Cranmer was a great Churchman. He first secured for the English people the right to own and study the Bible in the English tongue, and he gave the Church of England her Prayer Book, which work is his best memorial.

The second volume in the series is *John Wesley*, by the Rev. W. H. Hutton, D.D. (Macmillan; 6s. net). This is a volume which is equally fitted to inform the general reader and to charm the scholar. It is eminently readable, and without being overburdened with detail it gives a sufficient outline of the great preacher's life and work. But perhaps it is most admirable in the judicious, fair, and charitable estimate it gives of Wesley's character, and in the artistic skill with which it makes his noble figure stand out clear against the background of his own times.

Was Jesus an Historical Person? by the Rev. Elwood Worcester, D.D. (Milford; 6s. net), embodies the substance of two lectures delivered in Emmanuel Church, Boston. The first surveys the evidence of early heathen writers, and there is a particularly full discussion of the references to Jesus in the various texts of Josephus. The second lecture deals with the evidence of early Christian writers, and here the most notable point is a thoroughgoing defence of the Gospel miracles in the light of modern therapeutics. On this subject Dr. Worcester, as is well known, speaks with an uncommon degree of authority, and his book, though all too brief, is a weighty contribution to the matters of which it treats.

Under the Shadow, by Rev. G. H. Lunn, M.A. (Morgan & Scott; 3s. 6d. net), contains a series of twenty-six short meditations which first appeared

in 'The Christian' during the year 1926. 'They were written with the very definite purpose of providing short, simple forms of worship for the "shut-in" Christians who, through illness or infirmity, were "shut out" from the ordinary means of grace. They were written, too, with the earnest desire that they might in some small way breathe a message of hope to the downcast, cheer to the depressed, comfort to the lonely, and salvation to all.' We need not commend them further than to say that they are eminently fitted, in their wisdom and tenderness, to fulfil this ministry of love.

Pioneering in Northern Rhodesia, by Mrs. E. M. Jakeman (Morgan & Scott; 2s. net), is a simple narrative of three years' work at Luampa, a recently opened station of the South Africa General Mission. It is doubtless intended mainly to inform and interest the friends and supporters of the Mission, but it is fitted to warm the hearts of all Christian readers.

Sir Arthur Conan Doyle is, as everybody knows, an ardent spiritualist. He is as ardent a missionary of his convictions on the point, and the latest proof of this is *Phenias Speaks*: Direct Spirit Communications in the Family Circle, reported by Arthur Conan Doyle, M.D., LL.D. (The Psychic Press and Bookshop; 3s. 6d. net). Phenias is a spirit in the other world, and a great friend of the Doyle Circle. If we could accept these communications at their face value, they would settle the matter for good. They ought, at any rate, to be carefully considered by the public; and no doubt will be. They are part of the 'evidence in the case.' And so far as these conversations are concerned, it all seems almost too easy. There seems little difficulty in 'getting it over.' The talk is as free and as detailed as at a tea-table or the fireside. They are fortunate people indeed who can so easily and so frankly and fully converse with the people on the other side.

'British Preachers, 1925,' and 'British Preachers, 1926,' were so successful that the publishers, Messrs. Putnam's, and the Editor, Sir James Marchant, K.B.E., LL.D., have been encouraged to publish *British Preachers, 1927* (6s. net), and there is every likelihood that we may look forward to an annual volume in future. The choice of representative preachers—a very excellent one—has been made by the editor, with the assistance of the Lord Bishop of Winchester, Principal Garvie, and

Dr. James Black. Among the preachers are the Archbishop of York, Very Rev. Charles L. Warr, M.A., Right Rev. Frederic L. Deane, D.D., Rev. J. Harry Miller, D.D., and the Rev. Professor George Jackson, D.D. But if we are to make an inner circle we would place in it the Rev. Thomas Yates with 'The Raised Values,' the Rev. Hubert L. Simpson, M.A., with 'The Revealing Rent,' and the Rev. C. W. Gordon, D.D. (Ralph Connor), with 'God's Eternal Quest.' Mr. Simpson's sermon will be found, in abridged form, in 'The Christian Year.'

Winifred Kiek, Minister of Colonel Light Gardens Congregational Church at Adelaide, delivered a series of lectures at Parkin College. The gist of these has now been published by the R.T.S., with the title *Child Nature and Child Nurture* (3s. 6d. net). It is a thoroughly up-to-date but well-balanced study of the different factors in child development. It is unfortunate that space has made it necessary to leave out many illustrations and the practical application of principles. What we have whets our appetite for more. Turning to the chapter on 'The Child and Sex,' the first thing we are told is that the policy of silence must be broken. As the author shrewdly says, 'All knew that the child would somehow find out elsewhere.' Indeed they depended on his finding out elsewhere.' But in what way is information to be given? 'Very many good authorities advocate leading up to the question from a study of plant life, and this would seem very natural and easy. Of course, it would be really suitable in a case where a child was doing a course of botany or nature-study, but it would be a more or less artificial method with a child who was not accustomed to study plant life. He would be surprised at the strange lesson, and the very novelty of the subject would stir in his mind just those suspicions of a special and abnormal experience which we want to avoid. Whether this course is adopted or not we should remember, I think, that formal instruction is not what is desired. To give a detailed comparison or a long explanation is to rob the opportunity of its promise. It were better to devote one's attention to the flower until the process is fully understood, and then suggest that life in general is the result of the feeding of one seed with another. To my mind, this, good though it is, is incomplete without some references to the great and wonderful Power Who makes these things possible.'

In *Far Above Rubies* (R.T.S.; 5s. net), Mrs. Agnes Sligh Turnbull has done a daring thing. She has

taken a number of Bible stories and has not only filled in the background but has invented fresh incident. So the Bride of Cana is one Elisabeth, 'a bride with white in her hair.' She has been betrothed for many years, but the marriage has been postponed again and again because she is still needed in her own home. There will be diversity of opinion as to the wisdom of this. But if it is to be done it could not be done with more delicate fancy or in a more reverent spirit than here.

Palestine Awake, by Sophie Irene Loeb (Sampson Low; 7s. 6d. net), is the story of 'the rebirth of a nation.' The fascinating narrative of the colonization of Palestine by Jewish pioneers is told with great vividness and enthusiasm. It is an amazing record of an ancient land being visibly transformed day by day. Even America would find it hard to equal the growth of Tel Aviv, the wonder city of Zionism, which has sprung up near Jaffa, almost with the rapidity of Jonah's gourd. Said the Mayor, with a proud smile, 'During the last four years, when anybody asked me the population of the city, I would answer, "This morning the population of Tel Aviv is so many thousand," because by the afternoon or the next morning there would be a hundred or two more.' Lovers of Biblical Palestine will read the story with mingled feelings, and may wonder whether the new Jerusalem with its cinemas and jazz bands, its beauty parlours and cabarets, is any improvement on the old. But it cannot be doubted that here in the ancient Holy-Land we are witnessing one of the significant movements of history, and one which deserves to be closely studied.

It must be an extraordinarily difficult thing to write a short manual on Christian doctrine, covering the whole field and preserving a due proportion between the several parts. Yet the work, if well done, should be highly serviceable. In *Christian Foundations*, by Principal H. Maldwyn Hughes, D.D. (Sharp; 4s. net), we have a summary of the doctrines of the faith which it would be difficult to praise too highly. It is admirable in every way. It has been written 'at the request of the Connectional Local Preachers' Committee of the Wesleyan Methodist Church, for the use of local preachers and candidates for the ministry,' and certainly the local preachers who master this book will be well equipped for their work. It is not, of course, built on the same scale as the standard works on Systematic Theology, but it gives a bird's-eye view of the whole subject which will

enable the student to see at a glance the lie of the land. If any preacher is minded to give a series of sermons on Christian doctrine—and there is a feeling abroad in the Church that the time has come for a revival of doctrinal preaching—he cannot do better than take this book for his guide.

We are getting almost too much of Psycho-analysis. Still, there is always room at the top! And Mr. A. E. Baker makes out a good case for his examination of this subject in *Psychoanalysis Explained and Criticised* (The Sheldon Press; 3s. 6d. net). His case is this. First, his book is simple—a sound reason. Secondly, his book is frankly critical, which few on the subject are. Thirdly, his book is decent, a notable fact also. And finally, it is cheap! Well, can you resist all these arguments? Not likely. And when you do spend your 3s. 6d. (net) you will really get good value. Mr. Baker is well informed, fully expository, and entirely sceptical of the value of Freud's work as a contribution to truth. He ventures to do what very few venture—he denies the very existence of the Unconscious! This is courage indeed, and what is worse (or better), he has his very persuasive reasons. But the same common sense and the same douche of cold reason are applied all round. Do not imagine this is a superficial and scornful rejection of the New Psychology. Its truth is granted, but its errors and its assumptions are ruthlessly analysed.

Our Great Heritage, by W. T. F. Jarrold (Simpkin, Marshall; 5s. net), is written in support of the British-Israel theory. It tells how the prophet Jeremiah fled from Egypt to Ireland, bringing with him a Jewish princess through whom the British royal house comes to be of the lineage of David, with many other tales of a like kind. The author's conception of historical evidence is extraordinary, and only to be matched by his impossible pictures of the future, when a restored Israel shall occupy all Arabia and build a mile-square temple in the centre.

The Apocalypse in the Light of To-day, by Rev. J. O. Bevan, M.A., F.S.A. (Skeffington; 4s. 6d. net), is a brief and popular exposition of the principal symbols and main ideas of the Apocalypse. The writer makes no claim to originality, but he shows a competent knowledge of modern commentaries on the book. His treatment is perhaps too slight to serve the purpose of the student, but it will give the general reader a very fair conception of the Apostle's thought, and may lead some to

'see visions and dream dreams,' without which no Christian can be 'what he was intended to be—a mystic and an idealist.'

The Rationality of Public Worship, by Rev. J. E. Roscoe (Skeffington; 2s. 6d. net), is described in the subtitle as 'a polemic,' but there is really little of the controversial spirit in it. The argument is not closely knit, but the writer has many pleasant things to say about the value of public worship from the intellectual, moral, and social points of view.

Dr. W. O. E. Oesterley has put us once more in his debt by his translation of, and commentary upon, the difficult but highly important *Tractate Shabbath* (S.P.C.K.; 6s. net), which he has prefaced with a really illuminating introduction. To Christian sentiment much of the tractate seems wearisome in the extreme, and more intelligently than ever, in the light of this little volume, can we rejoice over the liberty from Rabbinic views of the Sabbath which was won for us by the emancipating words and acts of Jesus. Its painfully minute directions as to what is and what is not permitted on the Sabbath, and its unedifying subterfuges must not blind us to its real importance, both for the understanding of the New Testament and as illustrating folklore. Dr. Oesterley has brought out these and other points in a lucid and stimulating way.

The publication of *The Philosophy of Confucius*, by C. Y. Hsu (S.C.M.; 1s. 6d. net), is most opportune. Every attempt to interpret Chinese thought to Western minds is to be welcomed, and especially is it necessary to endeavour to see China through Chinese eyes. Mr. Hsu has given a brief but most

helpful summary of the teaching of Confucius, in which among other things he reveals some remarkable points of contact between the best Chinese thought and the teaching of Jesus. His conclusion is that 'Confucius' idea of God is more or less similar to that of Christianity, and that Confucius, though he was not a religious founder, has paved the way for Christianity in China as Plato did in Greece. Thus the gulf between Confucian philosophy and Christian doctrine can easily be bridged, if both are understood thoroughly and interpreted properly.'

There are now seven volumes in the 'Modern Series of Missionary Biographies' which is being published by the Student Christian Movement. The latest addition is *George Grenfell, Pioneer in Congo*, by Mr. H. L. Hemmens, the Assistant Home Secretary of the Baptist Missionary Society. It in no way takes the place of the classic life by the Rev. G. Hawker, or of Sir Harry Johnston's volume on 'George Grenfell and the Congo.' But it has a place of its own, telling the story of Grenfell shortly but in an admirably fresh and interesting way. And it contains not a little new information. Perhaps the most interesting concerns that strange recluse of Leeds—Robert Arthington. He literally modelled his life on a missionary's words, 'Were I in England again, I would gladly live in one room, make the floor my bed, a box my chair, and another my table, rather than that the heathen should perish for lack of knowledge of Christ.' He was straitened so that the Missionary cause might not suffer, and it was his gift of £1000—offered in the famous letter of May 14th, 1877—that led to the opening up of Congo by the Baptist Missionary Society.

The Messiahship of Jesus.

II.

The Evidence of St. John (1).

BY THE REVEREND J. O. F. MURRAY, D.D., SELWYN COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

In studying St. Mark we were in touch with the earliest stage in the transmission of the Gospel story. The sources of St. Mark date back to the time when the earliest converts in Jerusalem gathered round the Apostles to hear the story of the

things that they had seen and heard in the course of their discipleship. Jesus, as they believed, had been raised from the dead to His throne at the right hand of God as Christ and Lord. His will was the law of their life, and guidance in the dis-

cernment of that will came most naturally through reminiscences of the things that He had said and done. There would have been no demand at first for 'a Life of Jesus,' nor could the Apostles at that time have any sense of their Subject as a whole.

St. Mark retains the spontaneity and freshness of this early period. Each narrative has a value of its own. It is not regarded as a subordinate part of a greater whole. No attempt is made to mark distinct stages in our Lord's ministry, or to define the process of His self-revelation. It is this quality more than any other that accounts for the high estimation in which St. Mark is held to-day as an historical document. The Evangelist is under no suspicion of having distorted the tradition that came to him.

St. John has to meet the needs of a later generation. Christians are no longer content to ask for light on the character and will of their Lord, or for 'scripture proofs' of the necessity of the Cross and the Resurrection. They have become conscious that He is in some sense both human and Divine. Speculation is busy with the problem of the inter-relation of these two elements in His personality. In view of the absolute chasm that separated God and Man in the popular conceptions alike of Jew and Greek, any solution seemed easier than the essential and permanent union of these two elements without the destruction or diminution of either in the unity of His Person. The First Epistle of St. John shows that an alternative theory had already been propounded. This may well, as early tradition asserts, have been the theory of Cerinthus. It draws a sharp distinction between the human Jesus and the Divine Christ who descended on Him at His Baptism and left Him on the Cross. It denied that Jesus could be personally identified with the Christ,¹ and refused to acknowledge the possibility of an incarnation of the Christ. The theological implications of this theory St. John expounds and denounces in his First Epistle. He sets himself in his Gospel to give historical grounds for the faith which was in him, and which was

¹ To avoid confusion we must remember that the term 'Christ,' as we find it in Cerinthus and in the First Epistle of St. John, has a far richer content than it could have had in Palestine in the course of our Lord's ministry. The vague and confused anticipations, partly political, partly apocalyptic, that were connected with it then had for sixty years been acquiring clearness and power, at least in Christian circles, from the fact that it was as Christ that Jesus was ruling in their hearts, and was coming to judge the nations of the world.

clearly the traditional, however dimly apprehended, Creed of the Church.

We cannot therefore ignore the fact that the Fourth Evangelist has a dogmatic interest in writing. He takes pains to force the fact on our attention. Whether he thereby destroys his credibility as an historian must depend ultimately on the truth or falsity of his creed. A man would have no need to wrest facts to support a true creed. And, if he believes that human flesh has been the vehicle of a manifestation of God, he is of all men least liable to substitute figments of his own imagination for the Divine fact, especially when he insists that the revelation of the Word of Life, which meant everything to him, had been tested by sight and sound and touch. For with St. John faith is no synonym for lazy credulity. He is alive to the necessity for supplying proofs for the Christian Creed. He calls special attention to the variety and the fullness of the evidence to which Jesus Himself appealed in claiming the allegiance of the Jews, at the same time that He laid bare the moral causes that led them to reject Him.

The object of this paper is to examine the account that St. John gives of the self-revelation of Jesus and to compare it with that which we saw in my last article to be implied in St. Mark. His object in writing simplifies our task, at least to this extent: we have no need to look under the surface for our material. The self-revelation of Jesus is the central subject of the whole Gospel. Our chief difficulty arises from the wealth of the material thus put at our disposal.

To keep our treatment of this material within limits we shall follow strictly the simple outline of the subject as it came before us in St. Mark. The key to the self-revelation of Jesus in St. Mark lay, as we saw, in the fact that Jesus came from His Baptism with a strong sense, on the one side, of His Divine Sonship, and on the other, of a mission to preach the gospel of the Kingdom of God. We saw that with a view to bringing in this Kingdom He gathered round Him a band of disciples from whom He claimed absolute devotion, and from whom He elicited a confession of His Messiahship.

If with this sketch in mind we pass to the consideration of St. John, we shall be struck by the fact that point after point that lay under the surface in St. Mark is brought into the clearest light by St. John. For instance, the witness of the Baptist to Jesus had to be inferred in St. Mark from our Lord's answer to the Jewish authorities at the end of His Ministry. It is the one point in the ministry of the Baptist which has an interest for St. John.

The thought of 'Mission,' again, is found once¹ in Mk 9²⁷. It is implied in the Parable of the Vineyard and the Husbandmen (Mk 12⁸, Mt 21²⁷, Lk 20¹³). It is found in St. Luke in the text of His sermon at Nazareth, and again in 4⁴² (cf. Mk 1³⁸). But when we come to St. John the thought becomes dominant and all-pervading. It is found no less than forty times, coming in every chapter from the fourth to the seventeenth, and culminating in the words in which after the Resurrection Jesus sends His disciples to carry on the mission committed to Him.

Notice next the stress laid on the fact that the source of this mission is 'the Father.' We saw that the thought of the Fatherhood of God is present in St. Mark, most significantly in his account of the Agony in the Garden. But it is found hardly anywhere else. In St. John the Father appears again and again as the source of His mission. Jesus regards it as more important that men should recognize who sent Him than that they should discuss who He Himself might be, or what precisely was the work that He had been sent to do. It seems, indeed, as if faith that He had come forth from God takes the place in His training of the disciples that faith in His Messiahship holds in the Synoptists (Jn 16³⁰ 17⁸, 21, 25).

The fact is that while we are anxiously scrutinizing every syllable to find out what He said and thought about Himself, His own interest is not there at all. He is doing all He can to fix our thoughts on the Father, His Father and ours. Of course, He called Himself, as the Father had called Him, 'Son.' Of course, as Son He had a special position to fill both towards God His Father and towards His brethren. And it was of vital importance that His brothers should understand that position, not only for their sake and His, but also for His Father's sake. But His first object is to be true in His own life to His Sonship, and so to reveal His Father to men, and bring them back to Him. He says no more than is necessary to help them to find the Father where alone He can be found by them, in the life of perfect obedience which He lived in human flesh in their sight.

The fundamental fact of His completely surrendered Will is revealed once for all by St. Mark in his record of our Lord's prayer in Gethsemane. And one significant utterance makes obedience to the Will of God the token of spiritual kinship with the Son. But in St. John the thought of the sovereignty of the Divine Will colours the whole

life. 'My meat is to do the will of him that sent me, and to finish his work.' 'I seek not my own will, but the will of him that sent me.' 'I do always the things that are well pleasing in his sight.' 'The Son can do nothing but what he sees the Father doing.' 'The things which I speak I speak not of myself, but the Father abiding in me doeth his works.'

In the light of this fact it is less surprising that in speaking of the fact of His mission He seldom gives any hint as to the work He had been set to do. His work was to bring the wisdom and power and love of God into manifestation in the service of men in His Father's Name. By living as an obedient Son, doing His Father's works and speaking His Father's words, He so manifested His Father's Name to men that when He came to die He could say, 'He that hath seen me hath seen the Father.'

In so fulfilling His commission—and there are indications from time to time that the fulfilment would involve the laying down of His life—He could claim from His brethren a like completeness of loyal surrender to Himself by virtue of the authority inherent in that commission, and so open the way for them to the Life of the New Age, on which He Himself had entered, and which He had come to bring within their reach.

The Gospel of St. John sketches for us the different stages by which, starting with this conception of His office and work, Jesus strove in the course of His ministry to bring His claim home to the hearts and consciences of men. Two strands were closely intertwined throughout the narrative. The one concerns the self-revelation and all that it implies for the New Birth of Humanity as shown to the little band of disciples. The other records the efforts which Jesus made again and again, first to win the allegiance of the people and their leaders, and then to open their eyes to the spiritual causes of their murderous reaction to His appeal. We must confine our attention in this paper to the second of these threads. It fills what we saw was an obvious gap in the Gospel according to St. Mark. It records the preparation that Jesus made for the final appeal to the High Priest and the Sanhedrin at His trial.

The scene throughout is Jerusalem. It began, St. John tells us, with the Cleansing of the Temple at the first Passover after the Baptism. By this act He laid public claim to the authority to which the witness of the Baptist entitled Him. His zeal is kindled for 'his Father's house' (2¹⁶). The act itself was an act of righteous indignation. It was an appeal to the national conscience at head-

¹ Kindred sayings are found in Mt 10⁴², Lk 9⁴⁸ 10¹⁶; cf. Jn 12⁴⁶ 13²⁰.

quarters. It was a claim to be accepted as leader in a moral regeneration. The authority claimed was prophetic, rather than political. The High Priestly leaders refuse to submit to this authority, taking refuge under a demand for 'a sign.' The claim, however, is not to be enforced by any form of material or spiritual compulsion (cf. Mt 12¹⁸, Is 42¹⁻⁶). The rejection, as Jesus foresaw, must be consummated on the Cross (2¹⁹).

There seems no inherent improbability in the supposition that the Cleansing was repeated, when, at the end of the ministry, it was necessary once more to assert publicly in act the authority with which He had been invested. The difference between the words of the Lord on the two occasions is significant. On the first occasion the rulers are rebuked for making 'his Father's house a house of merchandise.' When their attitude towards Him is fully declared they are told that they are making the House of Prayer into a robbers' den. The authorities in the Temple were for the time allowed to go their own way.

The thought at the back of our Lord's answer is the same as that of the Parable of the Vineyard and the Husbandmen, and of His refusal on later occasions to satisfy similar demands from the Pharisees, as recorded by St. Matthew.

The same visit to Jerusalem was the occasion of an attempt to help an inquirer from among the Pharisees to understand the spiritual conditions which must be fulfilled by those who would understand our Lord's teaching or enter with Him into the New Order.

The conversation with Nicodemus fits the situation created by the work and witness of the Baptist. The reference to the Kingdom of God is in line with the account of the earliest preaching of Jesus in each of the Synoptists. The experience of Jesus at His Baptism—if that marked, as I have suggested, the moment of His own entrance into the Kingdom—illuminates His teaching with regard to the New Birth of 'Water and Spirit.' Even though the time had not yet come when He could Himself give to others the Baptism of the Spirit, He had Himself experienced it. And the Baptism of Repentance, which John was preaching, was of God's appointment for the whole nation. The Pharisees were defeating the counsel of God so far as they themselves were concerned by refusing to submit to it (Lk 7³⁰, Mt 21³²). Nicodemus and his friends would be vaguely conscious of the presence of a new power in the world. But they could not understand the laws of its operation until they had surrendered themselves to it. Jesus and the

Baptist were testifying of what they had seen and heard. No further progress was possible until that testimony is accepted.

The healing of the impotent man at the pool of Bethesda raised a fresh issue. By this act Jesus challenged the religious leaders of the people to reconsider the fundamental principles of their teaching of the Law. Here, as in all the recorded cases of healing on the Sabbath, the violation of the Pharisaic rules of Sabbath observance was direct and deliberate. The cases were all chronic. None could be described as urgent. This impotent man had been ill thirty-eight years, and might easily have been kept waiting till sunset, and there was no obvious necessity for him to take his bed home at once. Jesus cannot have been unaware of the criticism that His action would arouse. In fact His attitude to the Sabbath antagonized the religious leaders from the start, and set them planning His destruction. It was as direct a challenge to the religious, as the cleansing of the Temple had been to the political, leaders of the people. It contradicted fundamental principles of their religious teaching, and called them to accept from Him a revolutionary vision of the righteousness of the Kingdom.

Jesus, when challenged to justify His act, does so expressly on the ground of His relation to God as Father. St. John records in 5¹⁹⁻⁴⁷ an exposition of the principles on which His life as 'Son' is regulated; of the authority that belonged to Him; and of the witnesses to the truth of His claim which he would commend to their consideration. This defence, Dr. Westcott suggests, was given before the Sanhedrin. It is important to notice that the claim which is being expounded is Sonship, not Messiahship.

It will be worth while to examine this exposition in detail: 'My Father,' He says, 'worketh even until now, is at work at this present moment, and I work.' The point of this defence clearly is that, as Son, His life must be expected to reflect the life of His Father. And so His hearers understood Him. For, instead of raising the objection which we should have anticipated, that the commandment speaks of God as resting, they fasten on the pronoun 'my,' and the very practical application that Jesus was making of the relationship as revealing the law of His own life. He was making God His Father in a sense altogether strange and unprecedented. In spite of this commandment it had never occurred to them that their lives ought to reflect the life of God.

Our Lord, therefore, is able to leave on one side

the speculative question of the compatibility of rest and activity in the Divine life, and to re-state from various sides the claim that was exciting opposition. It is no doubt a wonderful claim, but, rightly understood, it is anything but self-assertive. It called men to realize, from what they saw, the power of God working through an utterly surrendered will. He had, no doubt, marvellous powers to exercise, and a position to fill of unique dignity and responsibility. All judgment was committed to Him. All men must honour the Son as they honour the Father. But He has not come in His own Name, seeking glory for Himself from men, but in His Father's Name. He does not even bear witness to Himself. He is content to leave the truth of His claim in His Father's keeping. But, for the sake of His hearers, He will remind them of the evidence already before them—the testimony of the Baptist; the testimony of the works that He was showing them from the Father, and the word of the Father Himself, acknowledging and commissioning His Son. But, alas! they were out of touch with the Father and so could not recognize His Son, or bring the testimony of their own Scriptures to fruition by enrolling themselves as disciples of Him of whom they spoke.

Such is the spirit of the whole defence. In the light of that spirit, utterly free from any taint of self-seeking, yet clear and resolute in its assertion of the position assigned to Him by His Father, and so sure of God that He can face without flinching

the unbelief and even the murderous hate of the leaders of His people—we can venture to look a little more closely into the revelation that He gives us of the source and spring of all His Human activity. 'The Son,' He tells us,—it is the principle of all filial action,—'can do nothing strictly self-originated. He can only throw Himself into any work on which He sees that His Father is engaged.' Even so the range of possible activity that is open to Him is startling in its extent. 'For, whatsoever work the Father is engaged in, that the Son undertakes after His example.' It must of course seem strange to us that one in our flesh should have such insight into the counsel and working of God. Yet if the word 'beloved' heard at the Baptism corresponds, as we should expect, to a real fact in the relationship between the Father and the Son, is it not natural that there should be no secrets between them? And is not a work of healing, utterly beyond the power of uninspired human faculty, wrought in the Father's Name, a witness that the enabling insight is a reality, and has been given to the Son? Can we doubt that even more marvellous works are yet to come from the same source?

No record is given of any decision on the part of the Jewish authorities. It is clear that no condemnation could be secured on a charge of Sabbath-breaking. The determination to put Him to death (5¹⁸), to which St. Mark also bears witness (3⁶), persisted, and was matter of common knowledge at least in some circles in Jerusalem (7²⁵).

The Rest of the Future Life.

BY THE REVEREND J. M. SHAW, D.D., PROFESSOR OF SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY
IN THE UNITED CHURCH COLLEGE, HALIFAX, NOVA SCOTIA.

THE thought of the future life as a life of rest is one that has appealed to men in all ages. It was a thought which appealed in particular to the early Christians, compassed about as they were in the early days of the Church's history with organized persecution and devastating horror and havoc.

I.

But this rest of the heavenly life has often been represented in a way which does less than justice to the Scripture representation. It is not a rest

of ecstatic idleness or glorified inactivity—what Browning calls in his *Paracelsus*, 'the lone, sad, sunny idleness of heaven.' It is the rest rather of fuller and more harmonious activity. 'They rest from their labours,' says the voice from heaven which John heard in his vision, 'for (not 'and' as in A.V.) their works follow with them' (Rev 14¹³, R.V.). The striking collocation or juxtaposition of the words is to be noted. There is in the original a contrast between the two words 'labours' and 'works.' The word translated 'labours' (κοπαι) carries with it a sense of weariness, of spentness,

of exhaustion. The 'labours' of the redeemed end in the grave; there the element of weary struggle and painful effort, it is suggested, is left behind for ever. 'They rest from their labours'—yes, from the laboriousness thereof, from the weariness thereof, but not from their 'works' (*ἔργα*), 'for their works follow with them'; in their habits, results, acquired capacities, their works remain and go with them into their new life for fuller development and achievement. In Milton's striking and noble words:

Thy works, and aims, and all thy good endeavour,
Stayed not behind, nor in the grave were trod;
But, as Faith pointed with her golden rod,
Followed thee up to joy and bliss for ever.

So much we may find already suggested by Jesus' own words. 'In my Father's house,' He said, describing the future life, 'are many mansions,' or, more literally and properly, 'many abodes' (Moffatt) or 'resting-places' (Jn 14²). The translation 'mansions' of the Authorized Version suggests to us to-day stately and permanent or semi-permanent residences, but this hardly brings out the idea underlying the word in the original. Rather the idea is that of an abode in the sense of a resting or lodging place. For example: As Jesus passed through Jericho, we read, He saw a little man climbing up a tree to get a glimpse of Himself as He passed by. And Jesus said to him, 'Zacchæus, come down at once; to-day I must abide at thy house' (Lk 19⁵). He asked for entertainment and lodging for the night. Or, in the story of the two disciples on the way to Emmaus, and the risen Jesus drawing near and going with them unknown, we read that as it drew towards evening they said to their unrecognized fellow-traveller, 'Abide with us, for it is toward evening, and the day is far spent' (Lk 24²⁹). It was an invitation not to a permanent residence but to a night's lodging—like a weary traveller lodging or resting for the night at a wayside inn and then continuing his journey on the morrow. Such is the significance of the word translated 'mansions' in our Lord's saying to His disciples in the Upper Room. 'In my Father's house there are many resting-places,' many lodging-places on the pilgrim's road to ever fuller perfection. Says Westcott, explaining the word used in the Greek, 'the contrasted notions of repose and progress are combined in Jesus' representation.' If rest, it is the rest or repose for the sake of fuller activity and progress, the rest of 'Going on and still to be.'

That is to say, growth or progress, it is suggested,

is to be the law of life in the future as in the present. Growth there will be, we may be sure, first of all, in the knowledge and realization of fellowship with God the Father and with His Son, Jesus Christ, through an increasing realization of the purposes of Him who is the source of all truth, beauty, and goodness. Understanding Him more perfectly, and entering deeper into His purposes, we shall be enabled to render to Him more perfect obedience. And growing thus in knowledge of and fellowship with God the Father and with His Son Jesus Christ we shall grow in fellowship with and love to one another. And growing thus alike in love to God and to Christ and to our fellow-men, we shall grow too in power of service, each individual life finding new and fuller outlets for the expression of its talents and activities in a society of progressively redeemed spirits.

II.

So it would seem that we must revise and modify somewhat the traditional conception of the heavenly life as a life of ecstatic idleness or inactivity. We must substitute a dynamic or progressive for a static conception of the future life. The rest of the other world will be a rest not *from* work but a rest *in* work, the doing of work which it will be a joy to do, work in which the highest energies, which are checked and impeded here by the limitations of the physical body and of our mortal life, will find increasing scope and opportunity.

A paradise of inaction, a condition of stagnant bliss without progress or development, this would be to the human spirit an intolerable burden. In this life man's highest happiness lies in the worthy exercise of his intellectual and artistic and moral and spiritual energies. And surely the life of the future will not be a mere contrast to the best life of earth. Rather will it be, we may well expect, a heightening and transfiguring of the life of the present, a life in which man's whole nature springs into a new vividness of activity, and the energies and powers of this life set free from the hampering limitations and weaknesses of the body of flesh, and provided with what Paul calls a spiritual body—that is to say, a body fit to be the instrument of spirit under more spiritual conditions—shall win greater heights of achievement than were possible to us here. 'My Father worketh even until now,' said Jesus, 'and I work' (Jn 5¹⁷). And if God and Christ are continually working, it would seem that those who would increasingly resemble them in spirit must participate in the same life of work and of activity.

What this work and what these activities of the future life will be, we can at present do little more than speculate. But our Lord Himself has encouraged us to believe, through His teaching, *e.g.* in such parables as those of the Talents and of the Pounds, that all faculties worthily employed here will receive additional and fuller scope in the life hereafter :

We doubt not that for one so true
There must be other nobler work to do
Than when he fought at Waterloo.

So wrote Tennyson of the Duke of Wellington. And we recall how in his poem entitled 'Easter Day,' Browning's spirit kindles at the thought of the possible development in another life of such a soul and such talents as those of Michael Angelo, the sculptor :

If such his soul's capacities,
Even while he trod the earth,—think, now,
What pomp in Buonarroti's brow,
With its new palace-brain where dwells
Superb the soul, unvexed by cells
That crumbled with the transient clay !
What visions will his right hand's sway
Still turn to forms, as still they burst
Upon him ?

Yes, 'his servants shall serve him' (Rev 22³), there as well as here. God, we may be sure, will not take the tools from our hands just when we have begun to learn how to handle them. We shall carry with us into the future life not our character only, but also our capacities and powers, those capacities and powers which we have acquired or are acquiring through honest effort and service here. Into the heavenly Jerusalem the glory and honour not only of nations but of individuals shall be brought (Rev 21^{24, 26}), for their fuller development and

satisfaction. And if our different works or lines of activity here are, as Scripture teaches us, so many ways of learning and practising the life of service which is the great thing both here and hereafter, may we not suppose that no small part of the work of good and true men and women in the world to come will be the exercise of their several powers and capacities on behalf of those less advanced than themselves in the kingdoms of truth and of beauty and of love ? Will it not be the joy of the intellectually and artistically and morally and spiritually advanced to share their good things with the intellectually and artistically and morally and spiritually inferior ? So at least some of the early Christian Fathers thought. We find Origen of Alexandria, for example, representing the more perfect souls in the after-life as instructing the less perfect and thus helping them on nearer the Divine truth and goodness and love.

When, therefore, the life in heaven is represented, as it is in Scripture, and especially in the Book of Revelation, as a life of unceasing worship and unending adoration, this is not to be taken as implying that there will be no other activity than worship there. Rather it is, as it has been well expressed, that 'all occupations of every sort, being overtaken for the glory of God and in His service, will partake of the nature of worship.' 'We are mistaken,' said the late H. B. Swete, writing on this subject and drawing out the New Testament teaching, 'if we think of the life of heaven as worship only in our sense of the word. Worship, no doubt, it will be, *all of it*, because in that world all work will be worship, and every act, being brought into relation with God, will be a doing of His will, an offering of a free heart to Him, a priestly service acceptable to God through Jesus Christ our Lord' (*The Life of the World to Come*, p. 105).

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Such were Some of You ; but . . . ¹

'Such were some of you ; but . . . '—I Co 6¹¹.

THE other day I was reading about a bird—I have forgotten its name. But where people had always

¹ By the Reverend A. J. Gossip, M.A., Aberdeen.

come upon it is away down in the south of South America. It is a sea bird. It nests on the cliffs where the spray is always dashing. It lives on fish. It spends its days, like the white gulls, poised upon the long, green, lazy swell of the huge billows. And then suddenly it's gone. Well, there is nothing much in that. Many birds migrate, of course. The swallows that built in your eaves

last summer have been spending the winter in South Africa. But where did this bird go? Nobody knew; and no one could find out. They searched, and they searched, but never a glimpse of it could they see. 'It must be somewhere!' they said. But no, they couldn't find it. It was worse than hide-the-thimble, when all the rest have seen it and sat down, and keep laughing at you who feel so hot and foolish left there all alone out on the floor, and yet you can't think where it is. But these people kept on searching, and at last they came upon that bird again. But no wonder they had taken a long while. When they saw it last it was away down in the south of South America. When they found it, it was far up in Alaska, in the north of the north. They were looking for a sea bird, and when they found it, it had become a land bird. They were searching for it on the beach; and they got it four thousand feet up in the mountains; they knew that it lived upon fish, and they discovered a bird that never thought of fish, but lived only on insects. It was a new creature, living a new life, in a new way.

That's a strange story, isn't it? But boys and girls can do that too. I've seen it. For a long time they are this, or that, and everybody knows it. And then somehow they become quite different; they, too, are new creatures, living a new life, in a new way.

You remember that fellow who turned up at school—a regular muff, wasn't he? He had been molly-coddled at home; he didn't play games; he couldn't do anything; he just hung about, and what a fuss he made about a shove or a tumble. But by and by you wouldn't have known him. He got keen, he threw himself into the thick of things. When he gets the ball at football now the other side have to look out; he is so daring, so apt to break through, and is so nippy with his passes. He's the same boy, yet could he be more different?

Sir Isaac Newton was like that. He was one of the cleverest men that ever lived. Yet as a boy, even a big boy, he was a bit of a baby. He was quite dull and always sat far down near the foot of his classes, never learned anything, and the masters said he was just hopeless. He never played boys' games, he didn't go with boys at all, but mooned about among the girls. And girls didn't play much then, as they do now—had a far poorer time of it. And Master Isaac spent his play-hours making chairs and tables for their dolls' houses—a dreadful kind of boy I think, don't you? But one day the bully of the school began to bully him, gave him an ugly kick. And that kick woke him up. Somehow he got up from the ground a

quite different boy. The first thing he did was to take off his coat and thrash that bully.

That's what you always read about in the school stories. But it never happens in real life. Well, it did this time anyhow. And then he threw himself into everything. He became head boy of the school. And as for lessons, he could do them slap off as easy as looking at them, and was by miles the cleverest in every class. And fellows coming back to the old school used to stare at him. You don't tell me this is Isaac Newton who used to loaf about with the girls and play the baby! Well, I never! But he's become another fellow altogether. And he had.

There's something to cheer you up. For, perhaps, you too are rather dull. You try and try, but it's no use. However you keep trying, you are always near the foot, can't get the hang of it. Well, perhaps you'll wake up too, if you keep trying. And even if you don't, there are other things than lessons. Robert Louis Stevenson wasn't much use at his classes in his day. But tell me, who were the boys that got all the prizes and medals? Nobody knows, nobody cares. They're all forgotten. But we know about Stevenson. He did best after all. Don't you lose heart. There are other things besides French verbs and sums, and you may do them splendidly.

Or perhaps you are one of those little chaps who are afraid in the dark. You don't like to own it. But you know it's true. Out in the passage, creeping up the stair, your heart goes quick, and you can't keep from thinking there *is* something behind you. And you are vexed about it because other boys aren't like that at all, and yet you are. Ah, well! I remember once a fellow at the War who had crept out into the darkness of No Man's Land, and done wonderful things out there all alone, where every one felt creepy. And when I went to see him next day he laughed. 'It's a funny thing,' he said, 'this should happen to me. For as a boy I was dreadfully afraid of the dark, would make any excuse, would tell lies, I'm afraid, to get staying in the lit room just a wee bit longer. Well, it just shows that, if you stand up to it, you can beat anything.' He did; he became a new creature with new ways; and so can you.

So if you feel a horrid little chap in some ways; if you're ashamed about it; if, when you get into bed, you're dreadfully vexed you were so sulky and bad humoured and unkind; if you make up your mind you're done with that, and yet next day are just the same again, don't you give up! 'Such were some of you,' said Paul, after rolling

off a whole long list of hideous things—'such were some of you: but' not now. All that is left behind, and you're quite different. A sea bird that becomes a land bird; that eats fish, and that won't look at fish; that builds on the cliffs, and that leaves these for the mountains. Funny, isn't it? But that's nothing. For, grubby, crabbed, sulky, little beggar as you are, you can become, like Jesus Christ, as big and brave and wonderful as that! Really you can. What do you say? Let's have a try!

Off with his Head!¹

'The way of evil men, avoid it . . . '—Pr 4^{14, 15}.

Of course, you know well enough the crusty old Queen in *Alice* who was for ever ordering 'Heads off!' but the story was quite new to my lawn-mower. He listened without saying a word, as I read it to my little boy the other evening. The funny old Queen seemed a real heroine to my lawn-mower, and the next morning when I took him out of the tool shed, I heard him say, as soon as ever he began to travel over the lawn, 'Off with his head! off with his head!' He had caught sight of the dandelions and buttercups and daisies that will grow there. 'Off with his head!' he said, and sure enough those golden heads were soon off. My lawn-mower seemed thoroughly to enjoy his horrid work, and when I trundled him back into the shed again, he was purring loudly to himself, just as our dear old cat Ophelia does when we stroke her. I tell you he was pleased with himself. And he started the same game the next time, and kept it up the time after, until I had to say to myself, 'Why, the lawn-mower is splendid, he does not leave a single dandelion behind him.'

And then a wonderful thing began to happen. The dandelions and daisies although they had lost their heads had not lost their wits, for they had a 'confab' among themselves, right down under the grass, so that the lawn-mower could not hear them, and they decided that they had lost their heads because they had worn them on too long a neck, so they made up their minds to arrange for shorter necks and dodge the executioner! And they were as good as their word, for when next I brought out my lawn-mower, he was still in his old blood-thirsty mood—'Off with his head! off with his head!' he rattled as I rolled him up to the grass. But though the cutting blades were as sharp as ever, the mower went clean over the fresh dandelions, and I could almost hear them laugh at him as he

looked back with surprise. The dandelions had beaten him! They had made their necks so short that it was impossible for the lawn-mower to touch them; and I had to go out after he had finished his work and dig them out with a knife, or I should soon have had my garden full. I can tell you my lawn-mower did not like the trick; at first he declared it was not his fault, he said the blades wanted sharpening, and he would like a drink of oil. But really it wasn't that. He had actually lost the power to cut off their heads, because they had been too clever for him. He still grumbles out, 'Off with his head! off with his head!' but he is almost as helpless as the poor old Queen, for the heads do not come off; and all his brave threats are in vain. Don't you think that was clever of my dandelions? I do. And let me tell you this, I made up my mind to try the same trick, because I know some people who always do me harm when I am with them. They say all sorts of unkind things, or they are always grumbling, or they ask me to do mean things, and I must confess that sometimes they have got me; but I am going to grow a shorter neck, I am going to keep my head out of danger's way. When they are about, I shan't be! and, I think, by 'lying low' I shall be as safe as the dandelions. Suppose you try this way too. I can see a half-dozen dandelions on my lawn that will give the method a hearty testimonial.

The Christian Year.

TRINITY SUNDAY.

A New Life.

'Let him come unto me.'—Jn 7³⁷.

No one, I think, who examines life to-day will deny the presence of two tendencies whose existence in life, especially when combined in the experience of a single individual, constitutes almost a strange paradox. The one, observable in the character and conduct of men and in that materialistic outlook which characterizes the view of not a few of our age, may perhaps be described as the spirit of self-sufficiency. The other, steadily becoming more apparent and making itself felt in spite of a superficial materialism, may be described as the recognition of some spiritual force ordering and controlling the affairs of men.

1. There is, first, *the spirit of self-sufficiency*. Never, I suppose, in the inculcation of ethical teaching, has the stress upon the power of character, the necessity for the exercise of the will, been more insistent or more widely expressed. A youth, for

¹ By the Reverend Frank J. Gould, A.T.S., Watford.

example, starts upon life. What is the kind of advice that is tendered to him? Is it not something like this: 'You must train the faculties that you possess; you must mould the character which is yours; the spheres of life in which you move must reflect yourself; in you and in them lies the secret of success'?

Nor is it only in the advice that is proffered by the elder to the younger that this is to be seen. The methods of enterprise observable in every department of life, the machinery men employ, the spirit of toil, all attest it. Everywhere men who would succeed, who would mould the world to their wishes and to their will, look not so much to the passing circumstances, or to the opportunity of the moment—though they may seize it—but they look for the power of themselves to attain.

2. And yet side by side with the spirit of self-sufficiency there is *the recognition of some spiritual force ordering and controlling the affairs of men*. Science is more and more determining for us that the basis of things is ideal and spiritual. We have even novelists whose themes are not merely those of fiction or of history, but who are endeavouring to show that behind life lies some spiritual ideal. We have philosophic theories which have made the theory of materialism bankrupt.

Men may say to us that the only force which can conquer life and gain its possession lies within, that a man's attainment can only be measured by the degree in which he can impress his character upon the circle that surrounds him. But the fact remains that, affecting this method, revealing itself in unexpected ways, there are actions and principles of action which testify to the power of the unseen and the spiritual to aid them. It may give rise, as in some quarters of the world it does, to a strange and fanciful belief, or it may take a nobler form, as in much of the best speculative thought of to-day; but the point remains that it is a growing and increasingly influential power in the common affairs of human life.

3. There is one answer to the problem of *how these two tendencies* which are inherent in human nature *can be reconciled and utilized*. The Church, in spite of many a lapse, in spite of the overwhelming power of the world, which has sometimes distorted its outlook, has but one, and it is a unifying one. It takes the tendency to self-sufficiency, and shows where it may be ennobled. It takes the tendency to regard spiritual powers as a force in life, and shows what is their real basis. The Church whose foremost missionary could write such a splendid series of ethical instructions as is to be

found in the twelfth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, and could dictate such warnings as are to be found in the last chapter of the Epistle to the Galatians, such a Church could never despise real culture. Nor, on the other hand, would she deprecate looking for the ideal and the spiritual. She comes to the man who has found something of these things and discovered their help and assistance, and she says to him: 'You have done well.' It is in these things that you will find strength. But you must go deeper. Behind spiritual aspiration lies some spiritual reality. Behind character lies creed. Behind all these things lies one great inspiring reality. What is it? It is that, surely, which the nature of man witnesses to, it is that which all our thoughts more or less are tending towards to-day—personality. And for us who own the sway of Christ it is the personality of Jesus of Nazareth—Man, but Son of God.

We face to-day, in the changing order of national and of social life, a noble duty and an entrancing task. What is that duty, and what is that task? It is the duty as never before, the obligation most important, of permeating the common affairs of life with the Christian spirit exemplified in Christian lives. But the noblest task by heaven decreed needs inspiration for its performance. There is no great movement in the history of the world but has started from some ideal. Some aim, some noble inspiration must lie behind it or it will fail. And behind all great movements there lies some great personality in which the ideal and the aim have become incarnate. Take an illustration.

It may well be that the conception of brotherhood and the development of social life were at the beginning of the movement for the emancipation of the slaves, but at the back of these things were great personalities—Abraham Lincoln and James Russell Lowell as the pact of its expression. For as Whittier set it down, so is it true of all movements in which ideas become incarnate in the lives of men:

The letter fails, and systems fall,
And every symbol wanes;

But warm, sweet, tender, even yet
A present help is he;
And faith has still its Olivet,
And love its Galilee.

If, then, it be so—and all experience surely tells us that it is—is it not natural that when we are entrusted to-day with the tremendous task of reorganizing, re-creating, and re-uplifting in Chris-

tian principles the world about us, there should sound in our ears the warning that these things can only be done by men who have come unto the Christ? And was not the occasion of the words of our text significant? It was the Feast of Tabernacles. Two customs gave force to that significance. The one was the lighting of the great golden candelabra in the courts of the Temple, whose beams, we are told, shed light into the darkest corners of the city. The other was the drawing of water from the Pool of Siloam. The one spoke of the pillar of fire by night that guided in the desert, the other of the water that flowed from the rock. In that instant, when the thoughts of men were intent upon the wanderings of the past, and the stress and difficulty that had been, there sounded the voice of Christ, 'I am the light of the world,' 'If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink.' It told His hearers and His disciples that there might be all the wanderings of life, but they were not alone. There might be all the pressure of difficulty and of doubt, there might be longings for better things—then let them learn that the only power that can help them, the only inspiration which can uplift them, the only abiding force which can ever be theirs lay in union with Himself; and that with Him as their power, and with Him as their inspiration, all the difficulties, and all the stress, and all the burden, and all the care, and all the hardship, and all the problems would be solved.

The answer, then, to the question with which we started lies in one word. It is Christ. In Him the spirit of self-sufficiency is transformed into that life in the image of which we pass from glory unto glory; in Him the gropings after something spiritual and ideal find their fulfilment. For in Him we can do all things. Is not this just the message that we need to-day? The cry, 'Back to Christ,' used in another connexion, becomes in our daily life insistent.¹

FIRST SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Love.

'On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets.'—Mt 22⁴⁰.

1. The instinct of the Pharisees was sound when they felt that our Lord's religious attitude was revolutionary even more in what He taught than in what He did, even more in His selection of the two commandments as the sum of the Law than in His consorting with publicans and sinners. For them the question with which they had so carefully

approached Him was crucial. It was meant, no doubt, to test formally the real measure of His adhesion to the Law. And they felt that the application of the test had been justified. There was something wanting in this answer, the lack of which they had suspected all along. It was possible, under the pretence of adhesion to this pious formula, to depress the value of all those traditional observances and beliefs which guaranteed and defined the exclusive efficacy of the Law. There was nothing more dangerous than this loose identification of the Law with its least exclusive elements. Where would be the unalterable necessity of the Law as the sole means of salvation if it could be thus lightly resolved into a hazy something which might embrace the whole world of men in its appeal, and yet a something which no one dare claim that he was equal to honouring fully? It was somehow thus, no doubt, that the Pharisee reasoned. And if we attempt to follow the line of his reflection, we shall probably, if we are honest with ourselves, have less reason to be surprised than we think we have at the conclusion to which it led him. Can we honestly say that the same kind of declaration from a religious teacher whose orthodoxy was suspect among ourselves might not induce similar fears in us? And might we not point for a justification of our fears to the fact that Christianity proved indeed to be the solvent of the Law as a fixed and unalterable religious tradition?

2. Let us think what the attitude of the Pharisee was. He did not hesitate for a moment, he could not hesitate, to accept the truth and even the sufficiency of our Lord's answer. He admitted whole-heartedly, or at least he honestly thought he did, that the great commandments of the Law were to love God and to love one's neighbour. But he thought, too, that it was impossible to keep those commandments save through one special discipline. The most intelligent of Pharisaic theologians would indeed have insisted that the essential value of that discipline was that it enabled men to keep the great commandments. But they would have insisted, too, that without it it was impossible to keep them. And then the great majority were not intelligent. That strict observance of legal detail which the Pharisaic reform had introduced as an aid to the fuller love of God and love of the neighbour had become for the great majority of the later Pharisees an end in itself.

It is out of such a habit of mind that religion grows hard and formal, that it forgets its true nature and dies down into a lifeless routine. And yet the pity of it is that into the narrow, distorting

¹ G. Nickson, in *C.W.P.*, xciv. 219.

moulds of that routine of formal obedience there is often run an intensity of conviction and a fervour of loyalty which, if they had been free to find the channels of God's real action upon the world, might have co-operated there abundantly with the beneficence of His grace.

3. And at such times of obstinate religious hardness there is no hope of salvation but in a new and living word of God. Yet when such a word comes, it is only the old word reasserted in its sovereign might, restored to its natural and essential primacy. All the old words remain. It is only the accent that is shifted. Not one jot or tittle of the Law is necessarily abolished. We may still need every detail of the old religious observance, but we have learned why we need them. The end has become the end, the means has fallen back into its legitimate place as the means. And that has made all the difference. That slight shifting of the accent has effected a religious revolution. The Pharisee was quite right. One never knows what the end of such momentous change will be. Men naturally take it for granted that there is only one way of reaching the end they have in view which it is worth their while to take account of. That is an inevitable consequence of the law of spiritual economy which all life obeys. We do not waste our time considering ways and means which for ourselves do not exist. The way that avails for us is the only way that counts. And there is always the tendency to deny all efficacy to any other way even for others.

None the less, God speaks the new word again and again through the mouth of His chosen servants—the new word which is only the old word recovered from the custom which, instead of enforcing, had really deadened its appeal. God trusts the heart and the living will of man where the Pharisee will trust only a fixed and consecrated habit. It was such a new word that our Lord spoke in the flesh to the men of His own generation. It is such a word that He is speaking again to this generation through His Spirit. He is reminding us once more of the true end which all religious means are meant to subserve. He is pointing the heart of man to its goal in the life which adheres to God with all its power of will and purpose. He is taking us down into the common world to show us how we may be true to God there; He is revealing to us the will of God as the salvation of this actual world of ours; the power of God in every act and purpose which would heal the world's wrong; the life of God in the best that is feebly and fitfully labouring to assert itself in the life of man; the claims of God in

the needs that clamour from human heart to human heart. He has given us, again, a world in which we can believe, for which we can labour with hope, which requires of us the spirit of love as its abiding need and our abiding satisfaction. He has, in short, renewed our religion, made it as wide as life, enlarged its boundaries to the farthest limits of spirit.

4. Well, it is just at such a time that we need the stern touch of discipline, the sincerity of a real preparation. We cannot afford to dispense with any means by which in the past our souls have been sustained in their high mission. We do not need so much to find new ways of training the soul as to use the old in all humility and simplicity of spirit. The desire to change the old instrumental discipline may be the very dissipation of our real spiritual energy. The straightforward recognition of its mere instrumentality, the sincere and steadfast purpose to use it as an instrument, will subdue and strengthen our wills to that end which God has so clearly defined for them in the satisfaction which they themselves demand—the love of God's righteousness and of our human fellows as fashioned by and destined for that righteousness. So alone is religion renewed from age to age by the reviving breath of God's spirit.¹

SECOND SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Revealing Rent.

'The king rent his clothes . . . and the people looked, and, behold, he had sackcloth within upon his flesh.'—2 K 6⁹⁰.

History furnishes few more graphic stories than that of the siege of Samaria. The plan of the invaders was not to carry the city in one or two assaults, but to camp about it and gradually starve out the garrison and the inhabitants. So great was the scarcity of food that an ass's head, which has but little flesh upon it, and that unsavoury, unwholesome, and for a Jew ceremonially unclean, was sold for some £5, and a small quantity of pulse or some such coarse corn, then called dove's dung, fetched about twelve or fifteen shillings a pint. It was when things had reached this extremity that the incident occurred whose gruesome details are recorded in the narrative. 'And it came to pass, when the king heard the words of the woman, that he rent his clothes; and the people looked, and behold, he had sackcloth within upon his flesh.' Like King James iv. of Scotland, with his iron belt, this Hebrew king had a hidden source of self-

¹ A. L. Lilley, *The Religion of Life*, 165.

imposed suffering. And in a sudden agony of grief for the wrongs and sufferings of his people the great man rent his royal robe, and through the purple rent the astonished people caught a glimpse of red and quivering flesh, teased and torn by the hidden garment of pain.

What strange and unutterable thoughts, what surging emotions, must have risen in the breasts of those who saw that sight! How the pain and the weariness and the wounds would be forgotten in the joy of communion and service with a king who stooped to share the sorrow of his subjects! The whole aspect of life, the call to defence, and the meaning of loyalty, stood out in a new light. The irksome siege took on a glory which it had not before; and the distasteful meal of ass's head became a very sacrament of valour.

The ramparts of Samaria are not more confining than the circumstances by which we all are walled about. And there are times when we grow impatient and disheartened in the endless siege and stress of life's opposing forces. And God seems to sit so unconcernedly and uninterestedly remote from, and so far above, the sphere of our sorrow. And then there comes that wonderful moment of revelation when, for the first time we look, really look, and see, through the rending of the seamless robe of God, the sackcloth within upon the heart of the Father.

To those who see it superficially, the death of Christ, the rending of the robe of His flesh, seems an evidence of weakness. There seems to such an one nothing in that sublime act which can help the desperate need of perishing men. But the people have looked and looked, and that rent which revealed the inner heart and nature of God has been the greatest evidence of power the world has ever seen. Where men thought there was but blind and un pitying might, they have beheld the sackcloth which veiled the sun, and have realized of the King of kings, according to those tremendous lines of Blake, that

Till our grief is fled and gone,
He doth sit by us and moan.

This glimpse of the hidden sackcloth has been the turning-point of many a life, taking it from among the weak and querulous and sending it forth to some post of valour on the wall. It would be futile to imagine that any single line of thought will ever enable us to enter into a full and satisfying explanation of the mystery of Calvary; and the fact that it has challenged the best human thought from its own day to ours without the last word being said

by any about it, suggests that its glory is as many-sided as life itself. But there are many who have seen its significance most sublimely and compellingly as the rent through which the sackcloth appeared for one revealing and ever-to-be-remembered moment in the world's history. The mystic is here at one with the man of affairs. 'The Mystery of the Cross,' confesses Dora Greenwell, 'did not, it is true, explain any one of the enigmas connected with our mortal existence and destiny, but it linked itself in my spirit with them all. It was itself an enigma flung down by God alongside the sorrowful problem of human life, the confession of Omnipotence itself as to some stern reality of misery and wrong.' There are many devout and honest souls who cannot find any rest or comfort in the old penal and satisfaction theories of the Cross. This much we can say simply and truthfully, that, in His pouring out His soul unto death, Jesus was not displaying some new spirit, but the Eternal Spirit who is behind and in all history. The Cross was but the rending of the garments which the King had been wearing from the first hour when the hosts of evil had mustered about the city of Mansoul.

That rending of the veil on Calvary must ever remain something of a mystery. And yet its meaning grows plainer and profounder in proportion as we share the suffering, and shudder at the sin, of the world. It was to those upon the wall that the sight of the sackcloth on their king came home with such meaning. And it is those who have taken their stand upon the wall of defence, to preserve the moral and spiritual well-being of society, who can best appreciate the meaning of the display upon Calvary. Prior to any theological approach to the Cross must be the practical acceptance of it in all its implications. This was part of the secret of the wonderful way in which the sight of those wayside crucifixes in France gripped the imagination of the men who were fighting and suffering there. There can be no doctrine of the Atonement that is not mere words for him who has not somehow felt the rub of the sackcloth on his own flesh, who has not endured something of the shame and suffering of the Cross in his own little life.

They altogether mistake the Christian revelation who think of Jesus, as so many tend to do to-day, mainly as a healer or a teacher. Such an estimate, however sympathetically, reverently, and beautifully it may be presented, does no sort of justice to the historical interpretations of Jesus, which have all, with one accord, contemplated Jesus, first of all, as a doer rather than as a teacher, and

most of all in one supreme deed. It is not the Sermon on the Mount so much as the Sacrifice on the Hill that will save us to-day. We must build our tabernacles, not upon the Mount of Transfiguration, but upon the Mount of Disfiguration—where His visage was so marred more than any man. In these days, when things every bit as horrible as the boiling and devouring of their own sons by the women who bore them are happening in our world, we must have a tremendous gospel to meet a desperate need. Calvary means this, if it means anything, that the fight is so serious that the King Himself has had to come up on the wall, and has been wounded. If we need God badly, He needs us too. Do not let us stop at the ass's head, or the devouring of widows' sons, or even at our own wounds, or we will go mad. Behold for our salvation the sackcloth within upon the heart of our King. Let us come and behold it in the sacrament of the broken bread and the poured-forth wine, and behold the eternal love of God displayed at Calvary, that love that will not let us go until He has brought forth judgment to victory.¹

THIRD SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Expanding Life.

'I will make you to become fishers of men.'—Mk 1¹⁷.

Jesus chose His first disciples from the fishermen of Galilee. There were no idlers among those whom He called to follow Him: Matthew from his custom-house, Simon and Andrew, James and John from their nets. They were all hard-working, busy men. In Jesus' invitation they recognized a higher call to wider fields of service—Jesus' coming to them marked an epoch in their lives. Their life with Jesus became an ever-expanding life—a life clarified by a vision of transformed values, vitalized by larger motives, broadened and deepened by wider horizons.

The words of our text are a symbol of the expansion of life wrought by their friendship with Jesus. Hitherto they had been fishermen. Had they never met Jesus, fishermen they would in all probability have remained. They sought no greater riches than they could bring to shore in their little fishing-smacks. The horizon of their lives was bounded by the margin of Galilee, the occasional visit to Jerusalem, and the gossip in the market-places of Greece and Rome and markets beyond the seas. They were contented that their life should be spent in catching fish.

And then one day Jesus came down to the Capernaum beach, and gave a new impulse to the lives of Simon and Andrew and James and John. Straightway their lives began to grow. New purposes were awakened within them. Their eyes caught visions of riches that were greater than any offered in the markets of Capernaum. The old horizons of life were pushed farther and farther back.

Our text suggests three ways in which the life with Christ becomes an expanding life.

1. When Simon became a disciple, Jesus began to transform his sense of values. Things which hitherto he had prized highly began to lose their worth in his esteem. And other things, to which he had hitherto given but little thought, became priceless. Hitherto he had been a fisherman. The chief values in his life had been the interests of his business.

You may judge a man somewhat by his conversation. What were the subjects most often discussed by these fishermen as they rested after their long night's labour, or exchanged greetings with friends in the market-place? The size of the season's catch of fish; the market price at Taricheæ; the stirring scenes at their last visit to Jerusalem; the latest gossip concerning Herod, and Pilate, and Roman Cæsar. Then came Jesus. And a new standard of values was held before them. 'I will make you to become fishers of men.' Those hated publicans who collected Roman taxes; the sinner and the outcast whom the austere Pharisees avoided like the plague; the despised Samaritan whose very neighbourhood brought defilement—those were the men for whom Jesus invited them to set their nets. The old topics of the market-place were gradually forgotten. And in their place we hear Simon at Pentecost preaching repentance and faith and the Kingdom of God, the joy and peace of forgiveness, and the indwelling of the Spirit of God. Old values were cast aside and new values became regnant in their lives since they were called 'to become fishers of men.'

Jesus has wrought a similar transformation in the values of human society. The challenge of the Master to the fishermen of Galilee to turn their attention from catching fish to catching men is a symbol of the expansion of life that Jesus has wrought. In the world to which He came human values were of little worth. The civilization of Rome was built on human slavery. Men were not citizens but subjects, the chattels of the emperor. The story of the progress of Christianity is the story of the rising worth of human values and the pro-

¹ H. L. Simpson, in *British Preachers* (3rd series), 119.

gressive subordination of material wealth. Slavery has been banished. The position of womanhood and childhood has been lifted from degradation and misery to honour and boundless opportunity. Property interests are becoming more and more subordinated to personal and community welfare. The Kingdom of Heaven is coming. The teaching of Jesus is transforming the ideals and the values of the world.

Every individual who becomes a disciple experiences the same transformation of values and ideals. The objects for which we were striving before lose all their glamour and become sordid and petty in the light of the new vision that He gives. 'I count all things to be lost for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord.' How trivial seems to us now the old ambition for personal profit and selfish gratification! For we have heard the voice of the Master calling us 'to become fishers of men.' We have had a vision of the riches of heaven, the incalculable spiritual blessings 'in the heavenly places in Christ.'

2. Jesus brought to Simon and his fellow-fishermen a larger and a nobler purpose. Hitherto the chief business of their life had been fishing. From henceforth they were engaged in bigger business. This did not mean that they were to forgo all gainful occupations. We cannot forget that for many years St. Paul supported himself and his missionary campaigns by the labour of his own hands. There were some in Thessalonica who were so carried away with the joy of their new-found faith that they ceased to work for a living and became a burden on their brethren. To these St. Paul wrote admonishing them to return to their tasks, and forbidding the Church to support any able-bodied men and women in idleness. The world still needed the labour of men's hands. But the task of making a livelihood was no longer the chief end and aim of their existence. The big business of these men's lives became, not the accumulation of wealth, but the building of the Kingdom of God.

This is still the message of Jesus to the world. He came to a world that was all absorbed in the struggle for bare physical existence, and for the piling up of wealth that could, by its very nature, prove nothing more than a mere transient possession. And His ringing message to men of every generation has been: 'Seek ye first his kingdom, and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you.' Jesus challenges us to turn our attention from the problem of making a living to that of making a life.

The life that is without Christ is still absorbed in the business of making a living. For how many of us has life little meaning other than a hard, back-breaking struggle for possession of a little hoard of material things. How much time do we spend in developing our mind, in fostering our capacity to appreciate and enjoy art and music and the things that enrich the higher life? And how much less time still do we spend in the cultivation of the spiritual life within, in deepening our faith, and in enlarging our capacity for communion with God?

When Jesus comes into our life, immediately the interests of the Kingdom of God become the major interests of life. The man who is in Christ will continue to farm, or to serve his community in the bank, or to build houses, just as he did before. And, if he is true to Jesus, he will be a better workman than he ever was before he heard the Master's call. But in his occupation he now sees not merely a means of making a living or accumulating wealth. He sees in it an avenue of service for His Lord. His life is infinitely larger and more worth while than it was before. There come to him satisfactions that were undreamed of in the past. For Jesus has brought to him a larger, nobler purpose.

3. The life with Christ is an expanding life, because it is life with ever-widening horizons. Think how amazingly Jesus pushed back the horizons of Simon's life. When first they met by the Galilean Sea, Simon's world was a very little world. We would call him provincial in the extreme. At the most none of these fishermen had probably ever been farther than to Jerusalem once a year. Their whole life was lived within the narrow limits of one of the smallest of Roman provinces. Their horizon was bounded by the margin of the lake on which they sailed their boats. They had little interest in anything outside of the concerns of their fishing business.

And then came the invitation: 'Come ye after me, and I will make you to become fishers of men.' And behold how He began to push back their horizons. He taught them to think in terms of the ever-growing Kingdom of God, beginning 'in Jerusalem, and in all Judea and Samaria, and unto the uttermost parts of the earth.' John became the beloved Bishop of Ephesus. Andrew travelled through all the countries surrounding the Black Sea; Thomas and Bartholomew are said to have journeyed as far as India; and Simon Peter was martyred in Rome.

Jesus is still pushing back the horizons of men. The old narrow Jewish exclusivism is banished

from human thought. Jesus turns our thoughts and purposes outward from our narrow self-centred life and we become conscious of our neighbours. We begin to think in terms, not of our own rights and privileges, but of our responsibilities and opportunities of service. The circle of our benevolence extends from those who are immediately related to us by ties of blood or friendship and includes our whole community. Then the boundaries are pushed still farther back and we are interested in

other communities, in distant parts of our own land ; and yet again, and our neighbourhood takes in China and India and Africa. World service becomes a challenging opportunity. Every revelation of human need to which we have the power of responding becomes for us an obligation of wider service. So Jesus is constantly pushing back the horizon. For the life with Christ is an ever-expanding life.¹

¹ C. E. Schofield, *The Gospel of Opportunity*, 59.

Present-Day Faiths.

Methodism.

By THE REV. A. W. HARRISON, M.C., B.Sc., D.D., WESTMINSTER TRAINING COLLEGE, LONDON.

No great division of the modern Church bears in its spirit and structure so much the imprint of one personality as Methodism does. John Wesley still lives in its ministry, its worship, and in all its Church courts. Yet, like many other great reformers, he would have desired least of all to be regarded as an innovator. The master passion of his life was the endeavour to recover primitive Christianity. The conservative instinct which perpetually endeavours to rediscover what is best in the past, while it is prepared to lop the mouldering bough away, is calculated to leave more abiding results than the more radical temper which has for its initial motto that of Ezekiel, 'I will overturn, overturn, overturn it.' Wesley's effectiveness in Church history is due to the fact that in his personality was that rarest of combinations—the great evangelist and the ecclesiastical statesman. It was indeed fortunate that his profound interest in ecclesiastical history came before his call to the work of an evangelist. Wesley had reached the mature age of thirty-five before he discovered in a 'heart strangely warmed' the real mission of his life. He was not, therefore, in danger of losing the sense of proportion when driven by this new-found 'enthusiasm' to preach his gospel in almost every parish in England. He took no step forward without finding precedents for his action in early Church history, or that justification which urgent necessity alone could provide for a mind that was eminently balanced and sane.

Although in 1738 his days of laborious study were at an end and those of practical administration were

about to begin, yet for the remaining fifty-three years of his life his mind continued to be remarkably receptive of new ideas. He continued to read persistently and widely and was prepared to learn something from any and every man whom he met. If so simple a soul as the Moravian, Peter Böhler, was able to help him so much at a critical moment in his life, then God might speak some new message to him by any one of His children. We are therefore impressed not so much by the originality of Wesley's mind as by its wide hospitality and by the amazing way in which he put his discoveries into practice. He was a strong Churchman with a very eclectic mind, prepared to surrender his dearest prejudices at the bidding of Truth.

The prejudices of Wesley were those of a High Churchman, in the eighteenth-century use of that term. In his own mind he considered himself loyal to the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England to the day of his death. He strongly deprecated the idea that the Methodist societies should break with the Established Church. They began as religious societies in connexion with the Church similar to those already in existence, some of which dated back to the days of Charles II. The spirit of the revival, however, made them missionary and aggressive, alive with contagious zeal. They claimed not only nominal members of the Established Church, but strayed dissenters and thousands who had not even a nominal Church membership beyond that of baptism in infancy. Had the Church of England known the day of its visitation it might have found a place in its organization for a

new order of friars, and Wesley's lay preachers would have been welcomed as the helpers of the parish clergy. Many of them might have been ordained, for there was a great shortage of incumbents, especially in new industrial centres. But the eighteenth-century Church was not only destitute of vision, it had neither leadership nor policy. Its Convocation never met and its bishops were largely non-resident. In the earlier days of the movement, the persecution of the Methodists was led by the clergy, and Wesley was driven unwillingly and step by step along lines that made separation almost inevitable after his death. His attitude to the Church is strangely similar to that of Thomas Cartwright and the early English Presbyterians; with this difference, that in the reign of Elizabeth it was possible to make uniformity compulsory, while in the days of the Georges, although much of the Clarendon Code was still on the Statute Book, it had become impossible to suppress a movement like the Evangelical Revival by State action. Neither Cartwright nor Wesley had any intention of leaving the Church; they merely wished to restore it to its apostolic condition. Cartwright had little of Wesley's missionary fervour, but he had a similar aim and came to similar conclusions on some important points of Church government. The main object of both men was to bring the English Church back to the state of the Church of the first three centuries, as they understood it.

Wesley's influence as evangelist and ecclesiastic is alive in Methodism to-day. As the spirit is more than the body, and life comes before organization, let us look at the subject of evangelism first. The distinctive quality of Methodism to the people of the eighteenth century seemed the violence of its religious enthusiasm, an enthusiasm closely akin to madness. Memories of the excesses of Anabaptists and Puritan sectaries at the time of the Commonwealth made 'enthusiasm' a very alarming proposition. Wesley himself dreaded extravagance and prayed for 'a calmly fervent zeal' for himself and his followers. In the main his prayer was answered. The Methodists brought a new warmth into the religious life of the land, and some of it they have preserved to this day. The saying of Augustine that 'one warm heart sets another on fire' was never better exemplified than in the case of John Wesley. May 24th, 1738, can hardly be regarded as the date of his conversion, but it was the beginning of his world-mission; a new discovery of the greatness of redeeming love sent him out of the little room in Aldersgate Street

with a strangely warmed heart prepared to set on fire the hearts of thousands. Methodist hymns are full of the symbolism of fire, as the element that burns up evil and spreads with startling rapidity over the landscape. Fervour was the first contribution that Methodism made to the lifeless Christianity of their day. It expressed itself not merely in their ceaseless activity in evangelism:

My every sacred moment spend
In publishing the sinner's friend,

but in the new passion that glowed in their worship. They sang hymns to an extent that no Christian congregations had ever done before; and such hymns! The output of Charles Wesley as a hymn writer is without parallel, and although the Methodists no longer call their hymn-book *Wesley's Hymns*, yet there are four hundred and seventy-five even in the present collection that claim that name. The Methodists sang the joy of their religious experience, and the hymn-book became also their great devotional manual. Its familiar lines rose to their lips not only as they went about their daily work, setting out like Seth Bede, repeating:

Dark and cheerless is the morn
Unaccompanied by Thee,
Joyless is the day's return
Till Thy mercy's beams I see,
Till Thou inward light impart,
Glad my eyes, and warm my heart,

but when they came to die it was the hymn-book they still quoted on the death-bed. 'Our people die well,' said Wesley; and he left them an example, singing almost in his last words his brother's hymn, 'I'll praise my Maker while I've breath.' Like Francis of Assisi, he went to meet God singing. Even when the Methodists took over the hymns of their contemporaries they put a new quality in them. Doddridge wrote:

Ye humble souls that seek the Lord,
Chase all your fears away;
And bow with pleasure down to see
The place where Jesus lay.

John Wesley altered 'pleasure' into 'rapture,' and in that single change expressed the difference the Revival had made to Christian emotion.

The secret of this new fervour is not far to seek. It arose not from a new fear of hell, as some critics of the movement suggest, but from a new discovery of the love of God in Christ. Watts-Dunton has coined an apt phrase to account for the great literary awakening at the beginning of the nineteenth century; it was due, he says, to the Re-

naissance of wonder. That new birth of wonder had spread far and wide in the hearts of the common people of England long before it flowered in beauty in the poetry of Wordsworth, Coleridge, Shelley, and Keats. But the wonder in the heart of the people had its source in religion ; a new vision of the world in the light of the Cross :

Hence our hearts melt, our eyes o'erflow,
Our words are lost ; nor will we know,
Nor will we think of aught beside,
My Lord, my Love is crucified !

In assessing Methodism's contribution to catholic Christianity, enough has not been made of the hymns of the revival, not merely for their own inherent worth, but as the best expression of the real secret of the movement.

Methodists are still warm-hearted, and they still love to assemble in great gatherings and sing emotional hymns. They are often the victims of the illusions of the mass meeting. Declining success in evangelistic effort in the ordinary chapel services has led them to cover the country with great mission halls in all the big centres of population. These costly enterprises, and indeed all the complicated activities of a highly centralized system, are supported with astonishing generosity, but it can hardly be claimed that there is the same missionary ardour as in the early days. Perhaps the best modern expression of that characteristic fervour is to be found neither in the Central Halls nor in the open-handed generosity of the Methodist people, but in what remains of a genuine family spirit running throughout the whole community. Methodism is a 'Connexional' system, and the links that bind congregation with congregation and circuit with circuit are stronger than the ties which unite any other large religious body. An itinerant ministry that was not permitted by Wesley's Deed Poll to remain more than three years at any one place, has done much to unify the whole system. Ministers travel all over the country making friends everywhere, keeping alive the same traditions, meeting in the family reunion at the Annual Conference, or in the District Synods, and finding there not only their fellow-ministers but laymen whom they have known in former circuits. In spite of their size the Methodist Churches still continue to be large families, though whether the same spirit will remain when they all come together in a still larger group may well be doubted. The same family spirit expresses itself in the Circuit system, where the stronger churches give their support to the weak and all combine together for new enterprises and expressions. Suburban life is not so friendly

to this tendency as the country town, the mother of many daughter churches, yet it is the Circuit system that has carried Methodism through many of the acute problems that have followed the War. In the individual church Methodism can claim no monopoly of the family spirit, yet every society was in Wesley's mind a very closely-knit corporation, and the classes and bands brought the members into much more direct relation with each other than was the case in any other communion. The ideal once again finds its expression in the hymn-book : hymn after hymn might be chosen from the section 'For the Society Meeting, Giving Thanks, Praying, Parting' to express this, but we will quote from one of the quaintest of them :

How good and pleasant 'tis to see,
When brethren cordially agree,
And kindly think and speak the same !
A family of faith and love,
Combined to seek the things above,
And spread the common Saviour's fame.

Many aspects of this family sentiment have changed, but the ideal still has its appeal, and no members of the modern Church in England are such persistent 'Swanwickers' as the Methodists. Their old love for religious fellowship remains and is a very valuable element to contribute to any new form of reorganized Church life. Dean Inge, in a somewhat caustic and sceptical discussion of the Lambeth Appeal, saw no hope of any response to it save perhaps from those whom he described as 'our warm-hearted Wesleyan friends.' It is true that he seemed to suggest that this was due to the fact that a warmth of heart among the Wesleys carried along with it certain compensating defects in intelligence, but we still prefer generous emotion to intellect and still preserve something of that catholic spirit which Wesley inculcated in his famous sermon on the text, 'Is thine heart right, as my heart is with thy heart ? If it be, give me thine hand.'

If the most important innovation introduced by the Methodist movement was a change of temperament, this came directly from Wesley the evangelist. But Wesley was also an ecclesiastical statesman, and he had not studied the early history of the Church in vain. He could find parallels in previous days for his love-feasts, his watch-nights, for the employment of lay preachers, and even for something that corresponded to the Class Meeting. He described the classes as resembling the periodical gatherings of the catechumens of the early Church ; the quarterly class tickets he compared to the *tesserae* and to the *commendatitia* or commendatory letters given to members of the early Church. He

found the Love-feast or *Agape* minutely described by Tertullian, and in Bingham's *Antiquities* were many details about the early Vigil or Watch-night. The love-feast has now ceased to be a regular observance in all the churches of Methodism, and is only held occasionally at special times and a few places where its popularity survives, but the Watch-night service in the closing hour of the old year has become common outside Methodism. Watch-night services were originally held monthly, but were afterwards restricted to New Year's Eve to avoid any possibility of scandal. Of these special and distinctive means of grace the most important is the Class Meeting. To this day every church member must have his name on a class book and be under the spiritual direction of a leader. The class leaders were under-shepherds of the flock of Christ, and many of them still do splendid pastoral work. Originally the societies were divided into classes of about a dozen members which met regularly on some week-day under the leadership of some one specially qualified to be a director of souls. Instead of resorting one by one to the Confessional, the Methodists confessed their sins to one another. They gave their experience of temptation, of deliverance, of doubt and fear, as well as of faith, hope, and love. As they talked one to another, listened to the counsel of their revered leader, and sang their beloved hymns together, they found strength for the conflicts of another week in an unsympathetic world. The Class Meeting has changed its form in many places, but there are still thousands of classes meeting week by week, and wherever vital religion of a fervent character is to be found some such form of intimate fellowship seems to be a necessity. The Class Meeting was the germ-cell of Methodism, and has been in the past so invaluable that it must be regarded as one of the greatest contributions that Methodism has made to our common Christianity.

While the Class Meeting has meant so much to the members, it has perhaps meant even more to the leaders, for such responsible work creates in earnest men and women a spiritual and sympathetic character. This brings us to another fact about Methodism which explains much of its remarkable development in the Colonies as well as at home. No religious community has given such wide opportunities for lay workers in the Church not merely at the business routine of serving tables and sitting on committees, but in the spiritual activities of the Class Leader and the Local Preacher. There are circuits in Wesleyan Methodism to-day with thirty-six chapels and only three ministers, so that Sunday

by Sunday thirty-three of the pulpits in such a circuit are filled by lay preachers. There are to-day in the various Methodist Churches in Great Britain over forty thousand local preachers who labour for the bread that perisheth for six days of the week, and are prepared if necessary to go out to some remote village to offer the bread of life to others on the seventh. The best apology for their labours is that heard by Ian Maclaren in a Cheshire Methodist chapel from a farmer who was a rather poor preacher; at the end of his sermon he acknowledged his limitations, but added, 'You may ask me why I, who am a poor preacher, venture to proclaim the gospel to others. It is because I cannot eat my bit of bread alone.' But the local preachers have numbered in their ranks some of the greatest preachers Methodism has produced. Their self-sacrificing work has made them read and think, and they have become leaders in the social as well as the religious life of their districts. The influence of the local preacher is written deep in the political life of England as well as in the churches where he has learnt the art of speaking. Forty years ago Canon Jessopp said of the Primitive Methodists of East Anglia that in hundreds of parishes 'the stuffy little chapel by the wayside was the only place where the peasantry had enjoyed the free expression of their opinions, and where under an organization elaborated with extraordinary sagacity they had kept up a school of music, literature, and politics, self-supporting and unaided by dole or subsidy—above all, a school of eloquence, in which the lowliest had become familiarized with the ordinary rules of debate, and had been trained to express himself with directness, vigour, and fluency.' It can scarcely be questioned that Methodism has given its members (whether men or women) remarkable privileges and responsibilities in religious service.

In the quotation from Canon Jessopp is a reference to the Methodist organization that had been 'elaborated with extraordinary sagacity.' The tribute is not undeserved. Wesley's was the mind that constructed the organism which remains in 1927 in essence what it was in 1791. The complete severance from the Church of England that followed Wesley's death demanded wisdom and statesmanship of a very high order if the gains of the eighteenth century were to be preserved. God provided the men for the task, and however much we may regret the manifold divisions of Christendom, we believe that it was in the order of Divine Providence that so elastic and effective an organization should have been evolved in the great colonizing days of British expansion.

Wesley was a strict Episcopalian, but in 1746, after reading King's *Account of the Primitive Church*, he came to the conclusion that bishops and presbyters were of the same order and that he was qualified to ordain his preachers to the ministry. It was only at the close of his life and for exceptional cases that he was driven to take this extreme step, but it is interesting to observe that he gradually organized his societies into a system that was in essence Presbyterian. The Leaders' Meeting corresponds to the Kirk Session, the Circuit to the Presbytery, the name Synod is now used by both Methodists and Presbyterians for the next higher court, since the former have changed their old term the District Meeting to Synod, and finally the Conference corresponds to the General Assembly. Methodism, therefore, in the British Isles is now more akin to Presbyterianism than to the Church of England, especially as the old doctrinal difference can hardly be said to exist.

The last generation has witnessed the decay of much that was characteristic of the old Methodism.

Charles Wesley's hymns are neither sung nor known as they once were; the percentage of Methodists who give their experience regularly in class must now be comparatively small; if Watch-nights and Covenant Services are continued the Love-feast tends to die out; ministers' terms of three years in a circuit are extended to four, five, six, and more years; old phrases of our peculiar language of Canaan are disappearing; denominationalism is dying, only the catholic elements of evangelical Christianity tend to remain. This may be because God intends to begin some great and new period in His Church by leading the different members of scattered communions back to their original unity after separation has served its own especial purpose. If at such a time Methodism as a separate entity ceases to exist, its ideals of close fellowship, of the family spirit in churches and groups of churches, its wide use of the amateur as well as of the professional in the pulpit, and something of its amazingly effective organization must remain.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Varia.

It is no surprise to find Professor Johannes Meinhold's *Introduction to the Old Testament*¹ appearing after seven years in a second edition; for, as an Introduction, it has struck out a new and fascinating path of its own. Whereas most Introductions confine themselves to the literary problems, analysis, construction, and probable date of the various books, Professor Meinhold has written an Introduction which really introduces the student not only to the literature, but to the great fields of history and theology or religion which are implicated in the literature; so that, in addition to the facts set forth in other Introductions and here presented with calmness and maturity of judgment, we can here follow the history of the people from the earliest times down to the period of the Macca-bees, and we can trace with ease every step in the development of their religious thought. These three strands of interest are woven together with great skill and subtlety, and at every point we feel that we are in the hands of a master who thoroughly

knows all that may be said against the position he is defending. It is interesting to note that he regards the Decalogue as of exilic origin, that he believes the Servant in the Servant of Jahweh Songs in Dt.-Is. to be Israel, and that he rejects Hölscher's view of Ezekiel. His warning against the temptation to draw too sharp a distinction between the prophets of weal and the prophets of woe is not untimely. More than once he pays a tribute to Wellhausen, to whom Old Testament scholarship will be for ever indebted. In a very interesting discussion on the text of the O.T. and on the Hebrew language he earnestly urges upon the theological student the great importance of a knowledge of Hebrew. But the things that interest him most in the O.T. are its 'eternal values.' No better Introduction to the O.T. can be imagined.

The social and economic conditions which prevailed in the ancient Hebrew state are discussed in a fresh and interesting way by Dr. M. Lurje.² He shows that the class divisions which are so

¹ *Einführung in das Alte Testament* (Töpelmann, Giessen; geh. Mk. 7.40; geb. Mk. 9).

² *Studien zur Geschichte der wirtschaftlichen und sozialen Verhältnisse im Israelitisch-Jüdischen Reiche* (Töpelmann, Giessen; geh. Mk. 3.40).

prominent in the time of the prophets are already present in the Song of Deborah. He deals with the problems of export and import, the development of trade, the various types of industry (working in metal, weaving, and pottery), the size of ancient Hebrew cities, the population of the country (which, taking Israel and Judah together, he thinks came to about a million), etc. The condition of the slave he believes to have been nothing like so happy as it is commonly represented. The prophets, though not social reformers, exercised an enormous influence on the social movement, and their fight for Jahweh was really a struggle for a nobler social order, or, at any rate, it found its most notable expression in that struggle. The problems traversed in this volume are the same as those traversed in relation to Jerusalem by Sir George Adam Smith in the latter half of volume i. of his *Jerusalem*.

To much fine work which has been done in the investigation of the ancient Hebrew cult, largely under the stimulus of Mowinckel's *Psalmstudien*, has now to be added a valuable discussion by Professor Hans Schmidt.¹ He believes that 'the day of Jahweh' was the New Year's Day of each year when, at the great harvest festival, Jahweh anew ascended His throne, and that cosmogony and eschatology alike took their colour from the circumstances of this festival. But he argues further that, as the chief rite of the first day of this festival, an empty chariot or lofty throne was borne to the Temple in the early dawn, accompanied by the jubilations of the people, and that to this, rather than to the ark, Ps 24 refers. The triumph of Jahweh over all His opponents was then dramatically represented, and the Divine King now appears as Judge; and in pre-Israelitic times it seems probable that this 'judgment' was made effective by the sacrifice of slaves and prisoners of war (cf. Ps 68²¹⁻²⁸). As in Babylon, the Hebrew king may also, like the god, have celebrated his accession every New Year's Day. It is the supreme merit of the prophets that they wove into the ideas represented by this festival their own uniquely ethical conception of Jahweh, and thus completely transformed the idea of the Divine judgment and of the day of Jahweh. In the course of the argument skilful use is made of the doxologies of Amos, and there are some highly suggestive emendations of difficult passages in Ps 68, the most important being in the untranslatable clause v. 18^c, for which by a very simple change he reads בְּכִסֵּא הָרִם ('the God Jah sits on His high throne'), which cleverly

gets rid of 'the rebellious also,' etc. This is a discussion which no one interested in the reconstruction of the details of ancient Hebrew worship can afford to overlook.

In *Der Mensch im Recht*² Professor Gustav Radbruch traces the conception of man which underlies the legislation of successive periods of history, and shows that the legislation is conditioned by that conception, the legal ideas of our own age, for example, being largely conditioned by the conception of 'the collective man.'

The varied and far-reaching influence which Professor Deissmann has exercised is attested by the interesting collection of essays³ contributed to celebrate his sixtieth birthday by colleagues, friends, and pupils. Early Christianity, the Grammar of the Koine, studies in particular words and phrases like *δύναμις*, *ἀναδείκνυμις*, *ὁν χριστῶ*, Paulinism, and other cognate topics are represented by discussions to which four English-speaking scholars make not the least notable contributions. Professor A. T. Robertson writes on 'New Testament Grammar after Thirty Years,' Professor Milligan on 'An Early Scottish Lexicon of the Greek New Testament,' Rendel Harris writes 'On the Trail of Marcion,' and B. W. Robinson on 'Influences leading toward the Conversion of Paul.' The practical interests of the Christian Church, for which Professor Deissmann has stood as earnestly as for scientific research, are ably represented by the concluding essay of Söderblom on 'Evangelical Catholicity,' in which he makes the interesting confession that he feels more at one with his Roman brethren who longingly pray and work for the unity of the Church than with Evangelicals to whom the realization of this unity is a matter of comparative indifference.

From the Catholic standpoint Professor Gaston Rabeau has written a comprehensive Introduction to the Study of Theology.⁴ It deals with the object and method of theology, and with its auxiliary sciences such as philology and psychology. Rabeau writes with his eye not only on theological students, but on unbelievers who stand outside Catholicism, but who are genuinely desirous of making its acquaintance. The writer is well informed, he

² Mohr, Tübingen; Mk. i. 50.

³ *Festgabe für Adolf Deissmann zum 60 Geburtstag* (Mohr, Tübingen; geh. Mk. 18; geb. Mk. 21).

⁴ *Introduction à l'Etude de la Théologie* (Librairie Bloud & Gay, Paris; 24.00 fr.).

¹ *Die Thronfahrt Jahwes* (Mohr, Tübingen; Mk. i. 50).

knows the Protestant as well as the Catholic literature, and he has an eminently fair mind. It is of great interest to note that, at a time when there is a tendency in Protestant theological seminaries to relax the linguistic demand, this Roman Catholic scholar urges upon students of theology the importance of knowing not only Latin, but also Greek, and even Hebrew. 'The theologian who wishes to be really familiar with the sacred books of the Old Testament must read them in Hebrew.' It will be well, he remarks, not only to know New Testament Greek, but even to acquire some notion of the history of the Greek language. Protestants who seek an easier way should lay these remarks to heart.

The not very numerous publications of Lucien Gautier have been supplemented by a little volume of essays or lectures,¹ published since his death, and prefaced by an interesting account of his career and personality from the pen of a friend. The essays are as valuable as they are pleasant to read. The subjects discussed are Luther and the Old Testament, the Rechabites, Post-exilic Judaism, Deutero-Isaiah, and Jeremiah, while a concluding essay defends the translation of כהנים by 'priests' (*prêtres*) as against the word 'sacrificers' (*sacrificateurs*), which has unhappily been reintroduced by the French version published by the British and Foreign Bible Society in 1910. Gautier was a Protestant of the Protestants, and in this chapter, as everywhere, his book is aglow with his passionate love of the prophets, who represent the Protestantism of the Old Testament as the priests represent its Catholicism. This explains his warm tribute to Luther alike as translator and exegete, and also his appreciation of the synagogue, whose worship was a sort of precursor of our modern Protestant service. His judgments of men and movements are characterized by a fine balance: he knows the good as well as the weak points of the scribes, who were much more than 'sincere hypocrites.' In discussing the Rechabites he makes the penetrating, if somewhat humorous, remark that to the average Israelite of the time Jahweh was in charge of the Ministry of War and Foreign Affairs, while the Baals presided over the departments of the Interior, Agriculture, and Commerce. Gautier, like Rabeau, was a strong believer in the study of Hebrew, following in this the precedent of the great Luther, two of whose words he quotes: 'I would like all young theologians to learn Greek and Hebrew,' and 'I have

often urged the learning of Hebrew. I would not exchange the little Hebrew that I know for thousands of golden pieces. Learn this language, if you do not wish to be taken for beasts of the field.'

Professor Auguste Gampert stoutly champions the Mosaic authorship of the Decalogue,² in its earliest form. Its exilic origin and the view of it as a résumé of the prophetic teaching seem to him alike indefensible, and he brings forth solid critical arguments in support of the traditional view. The prophets, he says, were no more the founders of ethical religion than the Reformers were the founders of Christianity: their religion was rooted in the religion of Moses. It is interesting to see here, as in other matters, the swing of the pendulum back to traditional positions. The old defences are gone, but criticism itself has furnished others much more substantial.

The modern critical view of the Old Testament has created problems for the day-school teacher, towards the solution of which he is entitled to look for some guidance to the experts. Such guidance he will find in a little brochure³ of thirty-one pages entitled 'The Significance of the Old Testament for Religious Instruction.' In it Dr. Weiser shows that criticism, so far from having destroyed the value of the Old Testament, has made it more than ever an apt vehicle for the training of the young. He sketches briefly the three branches of its literature—the historical, the prophetic, and the poetic—and then traces through them the development of Hebrew religious thought. Three points in particular he emphasizes—the supremely attractive power of the religious personalities of the Old Testament, the concreteness and vividness of its narrative, and its presentation of morality as rooted in religion. The teacher should welcome a literature which furnishes him with such material for influencing the mind of youth. But further, it creates a sense of universal history, and reveals that history inspired by a purpose: it insists upon the social aspect of duty, and it emphasizes the importance of the religious community to the individual religious life. The discussion is well fitted to reassure as well as to instruct teachers and others whom rumours of criticism have perplexed.

JOHN E. MCFADYEN.

Glasgow.

² *Le Décalogue* (Imprimerie la Concorde, Lausanne).

³ Artur Weiser, *Die Bedeutung des alten Testaments für den Religionsunterricht* (Töpelmann, Giessen; Mk. 1.20).

¹ *Études sur la Religion d'Israël* (Édition la Concorde, Lausanne).

The Gospel of Jesus.

Jesu Evangelium, with the sub-title 'A Historic Account of the Preaching of Jesus,'¹ is a volume of supreme merit, from the pen of Dr. Sir Lyder Brun, one of the most distinguished professors of the Norwegian National University. The book treats of Jesus and the forms and methods of His preaching and teaching; His relation to Scripture and tradition; His thoughts about God and man and religion; His Messiahship and all involved in that; His influence on the disciples and their mission; and, finally, the gospel of Jesus, and the gospel about Jesus.

It is a pity that so few in our own land are acquainted with Norwegian, and so are unable to benefit by Professor Brun's great work. We know of no Scandinavian volume in the theological domain to compare with *Jesu Evangelium*, for its scholarship, freshness, interest, and practical value. The book is remarkably well balanced, the section on the Son of Man being the longest but particularly interesting. And we have never

¹ Forlag H. Aschehoug & Co. (W. Nygaard), Oslo, 1926.

read a more informative account of the condition of the country, the religion, and the time of Christ than in the section that deals with the historic presuppositions for the preaching of Jesus. We have found no specially Lutheran tendency in the book, nor any point on which we feel seriously inclined to disagree with the conclusions arrived at by the author. He himself, in the closing paragraph of the Introduction, says: 'Undoubtedly many may find my attitude to tradition too conservative and at the same time think that I have not escaped modernising Jesus. On the other hand, there will possibly be those who deem that my attitude to the authorities is too free, and that I have pushed Jesus away to a bygone age. I cannot expect that I have everywhere hit the proper mark. But it is my conviction that the union of reverence and criticism which I have sought to carry out in regard to tradition, and the wedding of accurate historic research and direct religious conception which I have striven to realise in regard to the words and personality of Jesus, indicate the right line of work.'

J. BEVERIDGE.

Paris, France.

The 'Chaldaeans' in the Book of Daniel.

BY THE REVEREND H. H. ROWLEY, SHANTUNG CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITY.

In his book *In and Around the Book of Daniel*, Charles Boutflower says: 'It is one feature of the controversy which has so long raged round the Book of Daniel that points once looked upon as fatal to the early date of that Book are seen on further investigation to be proofs of its authenticity. This is the case with the "Chaldeans" who figure so prominently in the narrative portion. The defenders of the orthodox view would now be as sorry to lose the presence of those jealous, contentious individuals as to have the once much-debated, much doubted-of Belshazzar removed from the scene.'¹ In a former article (*Expositor*, Ninth Series, vol. ii, pp. 182 ff., 255 ff.) the present writer has shown that the account of Belshazzar in the Book of Daniel must still be regarded as fatal to the 'orthodox' view of its date. In the present article he proposes to re-examine the question of the 'Chaldaeans,' both in the light of Boutflower's

arguments and in the light of other considerations which he leaves unnoticed, and to show that no sufficient reason has been advanced to dispute the verdict of Sayce,² that 'the use of the word Kasdim in the Book of Daniel would alone be sufficient to indicate the date of the work with unerring certainty.'

I.

The term 'Chaldaeans,' wherever we meet with it in the old Testament, except in Daniel,—and it is found not infrequently, ranging from the earliest to the latest documents included in the Old Testament,³—is used in its ethnic sense. This use is particularly common in the writings of the prophets who were contemporary with the Neo-Babylonian Empire.⁴ That this is so is in no way surprising,

² Quoted in Driver, *Daniel*, p. 1.

³ Gn 11²⁸ 15⁷ (J), 2 Ch 36¹⁷.

⁴ Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Deutero-Isaiah.

¹ P. 35.

for the dynasty founded by Nabopolassar was a Chaldæan dynasty. For the statement that Nabopolassar was himself a Chaldæan we have no very sure testimony,¹ though we have one direct Biblical statement that Nebuchadnezzar was a Chaldæan,² but it is reasonable to infer that the dynasty was Chaldæan. For it is clear that it rested on Chaldæan supremacy. Rogers says: 'It is not possible to prove that he (*i.e.* Nabopolassar) was either of pure Babylonian or of Chaldæan origin. The kingdom which he founded was, however, plainly Chaldæan. The king's supporters were Chaldæans, and as the years went on the Babylonian influence quite gave way to Chaldæan.'³ It is therefore natural that we should find in contemporary Hebrew writers the term 'Chaldæans' used in its proper ethnic sense.

In Daniel, however, side by side with its use in an ethnic sense,⁴ we find it commonly used of a learned class of students of the occult.⁵ This usage is entirely confined to Daniel in the Old Testament. It is found, however, amongst the Greek writers of a later age. It first appears in Herodotus, about a century after the period in which the story of Daniel is cast, and thereafter in Strabo and Diodorus Siculus.⁶ On the other hand, this use of the term is devoid of any support from the inscriptions. Hence Schrader says: 'The signification "wise men," that we meet with in the Book of Daniel, is foreign to Assyrio-Babylonian usage, and did not arise till after the fall of the Babylonian empire.'⁷

This Boutflower meets by begging the question. He frankly recognizes that the usage of Daniel is unparalleled in the Old Testament or the inscriptions. He says: 'In the Old Testament the name Kasdim, "Chaldeans," is invariably used in an ethnic sense until we come to the Book of Daniel';⁸ and again: 'When we turn to the Assyrian inscriptions we find the word *Kaldu*, "Chaldeans," used invariably in an ethnic sense.'⁹ He proceeds to show that Herodotus uses the term to denote the priests of Marduk in the great temple Esagila

in Babylon,¹⁰ and infers that, as Herodotus visited Babylon only ninety years after its capture by Cyrus, this was also the usage in the sixth century B.C. This is scarcely cogent. To recognize that the usage of Daniel is at variance with all known contemporary sixth-century usage, but is in harmony with known later usage, would hardly seem to lead to the conclusion of a sixth-century origin for that book. Moreover, though only ninety years may have elapsed between the conquest of Cyrus and the visit of Herodotus, we cannot ignore the important change that had taken place in the status of the Chaldæan race. The fact that the term was used in a non-ethnic sense nearly a century after the fall of the Neo-Babylonian Empire would lend no support whatever to the theory that it was so used under the Neo-Babylonian kings. In the days of Herodotus, when the Chaldæans were racially insignificant, the term might have developed its other significance, but it can hardly be supposed that in the height of their pride and power, and in their own royal capital, the Chaldæans used their racial name in any but a racial sense.

J. D. Wilson proposes to settle the question by a false analogy, which equally begs the question. He says: 'Just as we call a scholar a "Grecian" who understands the Greek language, so they who knew the ancient tongue were termed Chaldæans.'¹¹ Here, in the first place, the assumption that Chaldæan was no longer a spoken language is unwarranted. The Chaldæans were a Semitic people, whose home was in the coastal regions south of Babylon, but whose language 'was the Babylonian cuneiform, almost identical grammatically and lexically with the Assyrian.'¹² Their inscriptions are in this language, and it is certain that this was the language of the government.¹³ But even if Chaldæan had been a dead language, the parallel would not hold. For surely Wilson would not suggest that *in Athens* a student of Classical Greek might be appropriately called a 'Grecian.' The analogy he presents is, indeed, a serviceable one, if he would but accept its conclusion—namely, that this use of the term 'Chaldæan' could only be of foreign origin, or belong to a time when the Chaldæans, as a race, had become merged into some other race.

II.

It is not, of course, denied that there was in Babylon, in the sixth century B.C., such a caste of

¹⁰ *Vide ibid.*, p. 39.

¹¹ *Did Daniel write Daniel?*, p. 57 f.

¹² *D.B.*, i. 368b. ¹³ So Nöldeke in *D.B.*, i. 281.

¹ Boutflower refers to a statement of Alexander Polyhistor in this sense. See *op. cit.*, p. 37.

² *Ezr* 5¹².

³ *History of Babylonia and Assyria*, ii. 493. Cf. Olmstead, *History of Assyria*, p. 633, where Nabopolassar is held to have been in all probability the son of Bel-ibni, the Chaldæan.

⁴ *Gen* 5³⁰.

⁵ *2^d. 10 4th 5¹¹*; perhaps 3⁸.

⁶ Driver, *op. cit.*, pp. 12 f., adduces passages from these writers.

⁷ Quoted in Hastings' *D.B.*, i. 368b.

⁸ *Op. cit.*, p. 35. ⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 36.

wise men as is referred to by later writers, or, as appears in Daniel, under the name 'Chaldeans.' What is denied is that there is any reason to suppose that they were called by that name at that time. Moreover, Boutflower is only confirming what has long been recognized when he argues that the learned class that is known to have existed was a priestly class,¹ and it may be agreed that the Book of Daniel correctly portrays them. Diodorus Siculus,² in describing the class he calls 'Chaldeans,' says: 'Appointed primarily to attend to the worship of the gods, they devote their lives to philosophy, enjoying especially a reputation for astrology.'³ We may therefore readily allow that Boutflower may be right in urging that the priests of Marduk correspond to the description of the 'Chaldeans' in Daniel and in Herodotus.

He is on less sure ground, however, when he argues that they were called 'Chaldeans' because they were recruited exclusively from the Chaldean race. In support of this suggestion he produces nothing that can really be called evidence. In this connexion, indeed, he calls special attention to the interesting fact that in the documents that have come down to us from the Neo-Babylonian age, 'the word "Chaldean" is never found either in an ethnic or in a class sense.'⁴ One would expect him to draw the conclusion from this that the use of Daniel is unsupported, therefore, by the known usage of the age to which he proposes to assign it. Instead, he argues from this that the Chaldean conquerors ceased to call themselves by their proper racial name, and he suggests reasons for this. He then proceeds: 'What still remains a mystery is how, being dropped in a national sense, it became attached to the priesthood of Bel in a class sense. Perhaps the simplest explanation is that in the days of the New Empire that priesthood became exclusive and only admitted to its ranks men of pure Chaldean lineage.'⁵ It will be observed that the absence of contemporary evidence of the use of the word in *either* sense is not only held to be consistent with Daniel's use of it in *both* senses, but is held to prove that it must have *ceased* to be used in its hitherto accepted sense—the sense too in which the contemporary Jeremiah and Ezekiel used it—and at the same time to show that it *was used* in a new sense. This is a strange use of the

argument from silence, and one is puzzled to understand how it can have so impressed its author.

We may pause to wonder at the psychological impossibility of his suggestion. Boutflower thinks that the Chaldean conquerors may have dropped their racial name out of consideration for the susceptibilities of the conquered. 'Possibly Babylonian vanity has something to do with this. It may be that the name "Chaldeans" was offensive to the Babylonians, as savouring too much of conquest by the foreigner, so that whilst a man might be a Chaldean, yet if he aspired to become a ruler of Babylon, he must both "take the hands of Bel," and call himself a Babylonian.'⁶ Yet a moment later we read: 'In the days of the New Empire the priesthood became exclusive and only admitted to its ranks men of pure Chaldean lineage,' and then: 'As, then, the conquerors generally were content to sink their origin, so the Chaldean priesthood may have been no less proud to retain it.'⁷ We are asked to believe, then, that the people of Babylon tamely suffered their religion to be gravely interfered with, and their priesthood to be radically changed, and to have the change even flaunted in their face in the proud use of the name 'Chaldean,' so long as the king solemnly pretended to be a Babylonian. We are asked to believe that these people, who had been under the foreign yoke of the Assyrians for years, were so very susceptible *except where their religion was concerned*, and that the conquerors reserved all their pride of conquest for the sphere of religion. This is wholly to ignore the place which religion holds in the heart of men, and to ignore all that is known of the place of religion in Babylonian life, and of the power of the Babylonian priesthood. So great a revolution in the religious sphere is wholly unlikely to have been carried through so simply and so calmly as Boutflower supposes, and it may safely be said that if the 'orthodox' case for Daniel relies on such theories for its defence, it cries aloud for burial.

That the name 'Chaldean' subsequently became attached to the priesthood amongst foreign peoples is a fact which calls for some explanation, but that it became so attached in the days of Nebuchadnezzar can hardly be inferred from the lack of its use in contemporary documents. We may best suppose, with Delitzsch,⁸ that the usage arose because Babylonia and Chaldæa were from early times the chief seat of astrological learning. To foreign peoples 'astrologer' denoted 'Chaldean,' since

¹ Cf. Jastrow, *Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*, p. 657.

² Quoted at length in Driver, *Daniel*, p. 13.

³ For the importance of dreams and their interpretation to the Babylonian priestly caste, see Jastrow, in *D.B.*, Extra Vol., 563a.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 40.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 41.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 40 f.

⁷ *Ibid.*

⁸ *Vide D.B.*, i. 368b.

the most famous astrologers were Chaldæans or Babylonians—and since the Chaldæan dynasty had eclipsed the Babylonians, the latter term was not used. And since the astrologers were priests, 'Chaldæans' became used to designate 'priests' in the pages of Herodotus. It is unnecessary to assume that when Herodotus visited Babylon, the Babylonians called their priests 'Chaldæans,' but rather that, as Herodotus was writing for Greeks, he employed terms in the sense in which they would be understood by his readers, and that he used the term 'Babylonians' to denote the ordinary citizens, in order to distinguish them from the priestly astrologers, whom the usage of the Greek tongue called 'Chaldæans.' It is wholly unlikely that there was an ethnic cleavage between the priests and people of Babylon.

Moreover, Boutflower has involved himself in a further difficulty, of which he appears to be unconscious. For if the priesthood of Bel constituted the 'Chaldæans' and consisted exclusively of men of the Chaldæan race, then Daniel is plainly unhistorical, for it represents a group of Hebrew youths as being selected for admission to the order (1⁴), and a Hebrew as being exalted to the position of chief of the order (2⁴⁸). It thus appears that Boutflower defends Daniel by throwing it over.

III.

We may turn to examine a further difficulty which he does not face. How can we suppose that a loyal Hebrew, who, according to the story, was prepared to risk everything again and again rather than be disloyal in the least particular to the religion of his fathers, should have consented to be a heathen priest—nay, even the high-priest of a heathen faith? The defenders of the authenticity of Daniel usually find in Ezk 14¹⁴, 20²⁸ references to the Daniel of the Book of Daniel. In that case we must believe that the contemporary Hebrew priest Ezekiel regarded this heathen priest as a pattern of righteousness and wisdom, though another Hebrew contemporary denounced in Deutero-Isaiah heathenism and all its works in no uncertain fashion.

It is fair, however, to note that Dr. A. C. Welch has no difficulty in supposing that a loyal Jew might have consented to enter a heathen priesthood in this way. He holds that the first part of Daniel had its origin in Babylonia, and related the story of certain typical Jews at the Babylonian court. He adds: 'There may even have been a historical kernel in them, and a memory of some distinguished Jews who were taken into the service of their Baby-

lonian masters.'¹ He even holds that this is a mark of a genuine Babylonian background. 'Daniel has no hesitation in accepting office under it (*i.e.* the Chaldæan kingdom) and in serving it loyally. He asks mercy for the Chaldæan magicians, and even becomes their head.'²

It is impossible, however, to accept this. Jews may have taken service under the Persian monarchs, but we must remember that the Persians broke the Babylonian yoke, and treated the Jews with consideration. The Hebrew prophet could welcome Cyrus as the Lord's Anointed—the Messiah of Yahweh³—and one of the early acts of Cyrus was to sanction the return of the Hebrew exiles to their Fatherland and to authorize the rebuilding of the Temple.⁴ Moreover, there was considerable affinity between the religion of Israel and that of Persia. Kuenen⁵ says that these two religions had more in common than any other two religions of antiquity. Certainly the Old Testament represents the Persians as religiously akin to the Jews. Cyrus is declared to have attributed his conquests to Yahweh, the God of heaven,⁶ which may imply the identifying of Yahweh and Ahura Mazda,⁷ and it may have been under Persian influence that from this time on we find the name 'God of heaven' for God, while Persian influence in Jewish theology would seem to have been deep and lasting. But however this may be, there is no evidence of Jews having accepted *religious* posts under the Persians. Much less, then, can we imagine such an ardent Hebrew as Daniel entering the Babylonian priesthood. For it must be emphasized that the various classes of men who are described in Dn 2², and classed together under the name of 'wise men,' were all priestly classes, and even though it might be argued from 2⁴⁸ that Daniel became the general head of all the groups, and that he was not in the particular group of the 'Chaldæans,' this would not carry us far. For this would still leave Daniel as the Arch-Priest. Moreover, we are told in 1⁴ that he was definitely trained for the 'Chaldæan' order. When we turn to Is 47, we gain a glimpse of the way in which Babylon and her rulers were regarded by the Jews, and it is marked by the intensest hatred. Especially is the author's scorn

¹ *Visions of the End*, p. 54.

² *Ibid.*, p. 52.

³ Is 45¹.

⁴ Ezr 1¹^a.

⁵ *Religion of Israel*, iii. 33, quoted in Menzies' *History of Religion*, p. 402.

⁶ Ezr 1².

⁷ But we must not fail to note that Cyrus also, in his Inscriptions, attributes his victories to Marduk. *Vide Rogers' Cuneiform Parallels*, pp. 380 ff.

poured out on the magicians, in v.¹³, which forms an odd commentary on the suggestion that Daniel's story of a pious Jew becoming head of the magicians is a bit of true local colour.

Welch remarks that 'these faithful Jews are singularly lax according to the views of later times as to heathen customs.'¹ He might with equal truth have said 'according to the views of the period of the Exile.' For a faithful monotheist to be a heathen priest involves so singular a laxity as to be a contradiction in terms. Welch further adds: 'All this implies an attitude of Judaism to its own law and to the world around it which is wholly foreign to the atmosphere of Jerusalem, especially under the Macedonian dynasty.'² This is wholly to miss the point. There was, of course, a Judaism in the second century, including even high priests, to which this attitude was not foreign, though it cannot be supposed that Daniel issued from its midst, for its laxity was not combined with strictness. That there existed a lax party during the Exile is less certainly attested, though doubtless true, but that there was any section which combined laxity with strictness in this fashion is no more borne out by contemporary evidence of the Exilic period than of the Macedonian, and is, indeed, quite inconceivable. Indeed, at no period can a faithful and strict Jew, least of all one who was prepared to throw his life away for his faith, have taken this attitude to *contemporary* heathenism. It is not the mark of local colour, but the evidence that the story was not written in the age in which it is cast.

IV.

But, indeed, quite apart from the question of whether or no Daniel would have been willing to be incorporated in the priestly caste of the Chaldeans, it is impossible to believe that he would have been admitted. For Zimmern says: 'The different classes of priests formed among themselves exclusive bodies with their own traditions. In this connexion the gild of soothsayers was specially exclusive, the office descending from father to son, and very strict rules being laid down as to physical condition as a qualification for priestly service. Similar, though presumably not quite so stringent, regulations would apply to other gilds.'³ From what is known of the Babylonian priesthood, it is wholly unlikely that the king would intervene to recruit the order with foreign captives, or would interfere with their exclusive traditions, for the

privileges of the priests were jealously guarded, even against the monarchs themselves.

While, therefore, Boutflower is right in supposing that the priesthood of Marduk was a close corporation, he is doubtless wrong in assuming that the Neo-Babylonian monarchs confined its membership to men of their own race—quite apart from the conflict of this theory with the narrative of Daniel. He adduces a tablet to show that two of the priests of Marduk sat on a judicial bench in Babylon, in a case in which a dependant of a high Chaldean official was concerned. This neither proves that all the priests were Chaldeans, nor even that these two priests were Chaldeans.⁴ It merely shows, what indeed was already well known, the position and power of the priesthood. It is altogether insufficient to warrant the assumption that the Neo-Babylonian kings radically changed the composition of the priesthood.

V.

Again, another difficulty confronts us. In Dn 2¹² we read of Nebuchadnezzar's command to kill all the wise men of Babylon, including the 'Chaldeans.' It is quite impossible to imagine even Nebuchadnezzar daring to exterminate, or even to order the extermination of, the powerful order of priests at the great shrine of Marduk. Still more impossible would it be to imagine this, if Boutflower were right, and these priests were not merely a privileged class 'fit to rank with the notables of the land,' but of the conquering race, and numbering amongst them the king's younger brother.⁵ The order was quite too powerful to be treated in this way. To quote Zimmern once more: 'In view of the important place which religion occupied in the life of the Babylonians and Assyrians, the prestige and power of the priests were at all periods naturally very great. Whenever any of the kings, as, e.g., Sennacherib, attempted to free himself from the tyranny of the priesthood, his action simply recoiled upon himself, and a

'It is amusing to read Boutflower's remark that 'Neither Bania nor Shamash-ibni (the two priests in question), we may feel sure, would be at all flattered to find themselves classed with the wandering fortune-tellers mentioned by Juvenal.' Apparently he is quite unaware that it is he himself who has classed them together. The people he is controverting deny that these priests were ever called by their contemporaries 'Chaldeans,' in the non-ethnic sense we find in Juvenal. It is Boutflower who seeks to prove that these powerful priests were also called 'Chaldeans.'

⁵ Vide p. 43.

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 52.

² *Ibid.*

³ *Vide* Hastings' *E.R.E.*, ii, 318a.

reaction always set in which only intensified the power of the priests.¹

It is, moreover, especially difficult to believe that Nebuchadnezzar should have determined on this extermination of the priests, for his inscriptions reveal him as a man singularly under the influence of religion, and particularly under the influence of the Marduk worship, in whose interests he completely destroyed the rival sanctuary of Bel at Nippur.²

We have, indeed, in the story the indication that we are dealing with a work of art, not of history, in the record that the captain of the guard sought Daniel, who was completely ignorant of all that had passed in the king's court, to begin the execution with him. It may, of course, be assumed that the command had already been carried out in the case of the leaders of the order, who had aroused the king's wrath, and perhaps more widely, but the impression created by the story is that Daniel saved the order, and since immediately afterwards³ we find Daniel being appointed to be 'chief governor over all the wise men of Babylon,' we cannot think of them as exterminated, but must suppose that Daniel was to have been the first one slain, and saved the entire order. This is dramatically effective, but historically improbable.

VI.

We conclude therefore

(1) That there is no evidence that the term 'Chaldeans' was used in any other than an ethnic sense in the sixth century B.C., and that any other use under a Chaldean dynasty is almost inconceivable.

(2) That there is ample evidence of its use in a non-ethnic sense amongst later writers, to denote the same class of people that Daniel designates

¹ *Loc. cit.*

² *Vide Jastrow, Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*, p. 646.

³ 248.

by that name, and that this class consisted of priests.

(3) That it is impossible to suppose that a faithful Hebrew should become a heathen priest, but that we have here the mark of a non-contemporary hand.

(4) That we cannot suppose that a close caste, like the Babylonian priesthood, would have admitted Daniel, or that Nebuchadnezzar would have dared to appoint him to the headship of the order.

(5) That our knowledge of the position of the priesthood and of the character of Nebuchadnezzar alike makes it unthinkable that he should contemplate the extermination of the priestly caste.

Against these positions Boutflower presents no defence. He recognizes the lack of contemporary evidence of the use of the term 'Chaldeans,' and proceeds to demonstrate its already well-known non-contemporary use. With the remaining points he does not deal, but builds a theory of a priesthood of exclusively Chaldean nationality, for which he provides no real evidence, and which is at variance with the Book of Daniel, which he is defending. For his theory, therefore, the 'Chaldeans' must continue to be a source of disturbance, witnessing to the fact that we must not seek in the stories of Daniel for history, but must rather see in them the literary form in which the author clothed his passionate call to the men of his day to be loyal to the faith of their fathers, to believe that the proud oppressor would be humbled, and the despoiler of temples and profaner of sacred treasures cut off, and that the day of deliverance, sudden and sure, abiding and unshakable, was at hand; witnessing, too, to the fact that the author was not a heathen priest or a magician, who dreamt and who interpreted dreams, and who preserved a correctness in his own life, but that he was a man in whom the urge of God's Spirit was felt, whose soul was stirred by the challenge of events, and who sought men with his message—a man who stands in the true succession of the Prophets of Israel.

Contributions and Comments.

Mark ii. 10.

ALL New Testament Greek students are indebted to Professor Hubert Pernot for his illuminating article on 'Greek and the Gospels' in THE EX-

POSITORY TIMES for December (1926). Particularly helpful are the explanations that he offers on the meaning of *iva*.

There is, however, one passage which he quotes in which, it seems to me, the usage and meaning of

ἵνα can be more easily explained. I refer to Mk 2¹⁰: ἵνα δὲ εἰδῇτε ὅτι ἐξουσίαν ἔχει ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. Λέγει τῷ παραλυτικῷ, for which I suggest the translation: 'But know assuredly that the Son of Man has authority to forgive sins on the earth. He says to the paralytic.' I regard ἵνα εἰδῇτε as a virtual Imperative and thus avoid the necessity of treating Λέγει τῷ παραλυτικῷ as an awkward parenthesis. And this use of ἵνα with the Subjunctive finds a close parallel in Mk 5²³: ἵνα ἔλθων ἐπὶ τῆς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῇ, 'Come and lay thy hands on her.' [For this usage reference may be made to Milligan, *Vocabulary of the Greek Testament*, pt. iv. p. 305a (3).]

DOUGLAS S. SHARP.

Durham.

St. Mark xvi. 8.

'They said nothing to any one.'

ALL the commentators who accept the usual modern view of the weight of manuscript evidence say, in the words of Mr. Willoughby C. Allen, 'here the Gospel ends,' and naturally are led to speculate as to what may have followed. Assuming that the First Gospel was written with a complete text of St. Mark accessible to the writer, we naturally expect to find in St. Matthew some hint as to the conclusion, if any, originally to be read in St. Mark.

Unfortunately, it would appear that St. Matthew has so condensed and telescoped together St. Mark's more detailed account, that we cannot infer what the verse at the head of this note specially signified. Mr. Allen, like others before him, translates 'they told no one,' etc., and we are left wondering how and when the story came to be told, as apparently the Fourth Gospel describes, or how Mary Magdalene came to return to the Tomb.

It may be suggested that the true translation is what we have placed above: it is at least curious that the very same expression occurs also in Mk 1⁴⁴, where Mr. Allen translates 'say nothing to any one.' The point would seem to be that urgent haste, in both cases alike, forbade the ordinary dilatoriness of courtesy and gossiping, familiar in the East. The command in Lk 10⁴, 'salute no one by the way,' which is paralleled by 2 K 4²⁹, is relevant to the same habit of Oriental society. The rest of St. Mark's expressions in 1⁴⁴, 'He straightway thrust him out, strictly enjoining him,' confirm this view in the one passage, and, if we may argue from it to the other, the women fled in such haste that they disregarded all passers-by whom they met. In this case the difficulty raised by many critics is due to their own way of translating the words.

T. NICKLIN.

Hulme Hall, Manchester.

Entre Nous.

A Personal Creed.

The Preface to *In Search of a Personal Creed*, by Mr. J. D. M. Rorke (4s. net), says: 'This little book is intended for men and women who want to find out what the central convictions are that make up a Christian view of life, and to discover whether or not those convictions are their own personal convictions. It is not likely to be of much use to any one who is in a state of willingness to be told what to believe.' Mr. Rorke's method is not to start at the top with existing creeds and doctrines, and find out how much of them are accepted and how much must be modified; but rather to start at the bottom with some conviction behind which one can't go. The foundation facts, he says, are 'yourself and the world you live in,' and from

these you pass to God. It is because the realization of the world and life is not sufficiently vivid that the realization of God is not vivid. Men have no mind for God because they haven't got a big enough place to put Him in. 'Supposing, then, we have some small vision of the Throne of the Universe, can we see God upon it? And what sort of God do we believe in?' Can we catch gleams and glimpses if we are responsive? Mr. Rorke finds that we can, and that the first stage is the coming to think of God as a Person. And then the next stage is that the very process which compels us to think of God as 'at least personality' gives that personality the colours that are best summed up in the word Fatherhood, and from here we pass to the thought of the indwelling God, and lastly to Jesus Christ.

In Search of a Personal Creed is published by the Student Christian Movement. It is to be hoped that it will have a wide circulation among university students, for though it is unorthodox—Mr. Rorke, for example, does not believe in the Virgin Birth—it has the power, in quite an unusual degree, of stimulating independent thought.

The Indwelling God.

'Nine-tenths of the material we would account as "sin," we don't for a moment visualize as sin against the God we ourselves, in our inmost hearts, believe in. Sin against ourselves, perhaps; sin against others; sin against some conventional Church figure of God. But to be found fighting against the God we really believe in and adore is a fearful thing. Here is an example, which, because it has that quality, won't, it is hoped, seem trivial.

'Four schoolboys on holiday at Richmond in Yorkshire had several times come on a water-rat feeding in the middle of a little pond on the top of a hill. They stoned it, but it always dived and escaped into a drain-pipe which was the only outlet from the pond. Another day, when they were passing that way, they laid plans, and the water-rat, caught again in the middle of the pond, was faced with all four of them standing directly above the drain with armfuls of stones, and no cover anywhere. It took its one forlorn hope, plunged in and swam straight towards them. The writer can still see its little wedge-shaped head arrowing the water as it came on, with the stones splashing all round it. When it was within about five or six feet of them it dived. But this, too, had been foreseen. A big slab of stone was held directly above the entrance to the drain, and, as soon as the flitting shape was seen under it, was let go. There was a mighty splash, and when the slab was lifted the dead body of the little furry creature was under it. The boys went on; such incidents were part of the day's play. But the one who had been chiefly responsible for the scheme, and who had dropped the stone, had an acute revulsion. He was silent; then quarrelling with his companions; then off by himself. A mere spasm of compunction is nothing. But in some way that incident made the deepest sort of mark on him. . . . Other effects are in evidence to this day, across the gap of twelve years to forty. The essence of it was, he had been found to be fighting against God—the God of a schoolboy, if you like, but real. That little wedge on the water, coming on in the face of death, bright eye, keen brain, plucky heart, no flurry, no funk, was the symbol of what was

beautiful on land or sea, of what one could believe in and adore. Any one would wish to be like that, and take sides with that. In all the books one assumed that one did belong to its side. And instead, one had been identified with the stupid, brute force that crushed it. Many readers, doubtless, will be able in similar fashion to recollect something that left a deep mark of pain or shame. Examine it, and see if it had not this special quality of sin against God—against one's own, real God.

'There's a vast difference between what we often describe as a sense of sin, and the realization that we've been fighting against the Living God—the God whom, if we don't love and adore, there's no meaning in the world or life. David passed from one to the other when he cried in his psalm of penitence: "Against Thee, Thee only, have I sinned." "Thee only!" What about Uriah? What about Bathsheba? Yes, but against God supremely, that's what he means. The supreme pain and horror is the finding God as a living, indwelling Presence, through the realization that we've been on the opposite side to Him.'¹

A Plea for the Bigger Thing.

In the Preface to *Saturday Papers*—published by the Student Christian Movement at 5s. net—Dr. Glover tells us that since October 1922 the 'Daily News' has given a column to a paper dealing more or less with matters of religion: 'For this selection from the Saturday papers I have largely to thank Mr. Hugh Martin, of the Student Movement, though he has been hampered by some interference from the author.' What Dr. Glover does not tell us, however, is that the circulation of the 'Daily News' is considerably increased on Saturdays, and that in Fleet Street it is understood that the factor which chiefly causes this increase is the Essay by Dr. Glover. The selection is an excellent one. The Essays are those of a scholar who is writing here in a delightfully easy and fresh way. They are full of pleasant allusion and stimulating suggestion. A good example of the talks is 'A Plea for the Bigger Thing,' from which we quote: 'It is not in the Gospels as we have them, but one of the Fathers of the Church gives us a saying of Jesus, which may be thoroughly genuine. It is in his vein. "Seek ye first the kingdom of God," we read in the text not always with any very clear idea of what it is we are to seek first. The "unwritten" saying is simpler: "Ask for the big things and the little shall be added unto you." What a discipline in prayer it

¹ J. D. M. Rorke, *In Search of a Personal Creed*, 62.

represents ! What a criticism of our small ideas ! And how close it is to his own pattern ! What else does the Lord's Prayer teach—with its cumulative emphasis in the opening petitions on "Thy name, Thy kingdom, Thy Will" ?

'Here, by way of illustration, is a story which I heard in America. A college president found his college in sore need of funds ; he screwed up his courage and went to a benevolent millionaire and asked for ten thousand dollars, but his appeal did not interest the rich man. A little later he met the rich man's son and told him about it. "You made a mistake," said the young man. "It wouldn't interest him. He's on the look-out for some such institution to which he can give a quarter of a million in a lump." . . . Then, again, our Theology is cautious, and inspired by the economies of the peasant, who thinks a bit and says less, shuts his mouth to keep his tongue from letting his mind out, lives in a little circle, ploughs a little field, saves a little money and thinks little and about little things. A poverty-stricken, canny Theology and a shrewd, cautious, safe Religion—and who can wonder that the Church does so ill ? A half-hour with a Greek concordance, or some English one that hints at the Greek—thirty minutes given to Paul's compounds of the word *hyper*—might open our eyes to the scale of his thoughts of God, the freedom and range of his ideas as to what God is and what He can do. . . . The Church has suffered from petty theories about the death of Christ. Sometimes the dominating idea has been an unhistorical notion about Jewish sacrifice—a notion more in the ascendant in the third century than it ever was in the Church of the first century, and forced upon the interpretation of the New Testament on the authority of persons neither qualified to interpret it nor otherwise acceptable to Reformation thought. The idea that God had to be appeased by the offering of Christ's blood is not New Testament doctrine. Paul puts it the other way round, and offers us a profounder conception at once—"God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself." Sometimes Roman law has supplied the very terms in which Christ's mind is interpreted. But Jesus was no Roman lawyer—person, substitution, satisfaction are not his vocabulary ; and to interpret him in such terms is to pour new wine into old bottles. At the best you won't get it all in. Happily, the Church has sometimes mended its bad thinking by not being logical ; it has constantly believed in a Christ far bigger than its theories about

him, acted on the basis of a more generous God and a more human Saviour, and been right on a scale beyond its theories.

'But there is a drawback about living on one scale and thinking on another. One of these days you pull yourself up and take your thinking seriously ; and you may begin to contract your scale of living. You have been tacitly living on the basis of a great God and a great Saviour ; but you find your theories only admit of a small Saviour and of a God who will go to a certain point only in helping you ; and what next ? You pay for your small-range thinking ; or, what is worse, your children do ; or, if you are a minister or professor, your people or pupils pay for it.'

Boredom.

Sir James Marchant has made a collection from the writings of Dean Inge and has published it with the title *Wit and Wisdom of Dean Inge* (Longmans ; 3s. 6d. net). From the heading of this paragraph it may be thought that we disagree, and that very strenuously, with the estimate of the title, and so we hasten to say that many very wise things will be found in the volume as well as not a little wit—which hardly needs to be said about one whose mental and spiritual gifts have long been recognized. We quote two extracts. The first is on Boredom, and the second on Suffering :

'I want you to think earnestly of the witness which Joy on the one hand, and its antithesis, Boredom, on the other, bear to the duty and happiness of creative work, that is to say, real work, on however small a scale. The happy people are those who are producing something ; the bored people are those who are consuming much and producing nothing. If you want to see examples of the latter class, look in at the bow-window of a London club in the morning, or at the carriages in Hyde Park towards the end of the season. While we are still on our probation, God punishes the useless by giving them pleasure without joy ; and very wearisome they find it. We are all given the choice whether we will crawl or climb. Parasitism is open to us, if we like. Choose it, and pleasure, that apple of Sodom—may be yours ; but you will wholly forfeit joy.¹

Suffering.

'The great message of the *Cross* stands or falls with the divinity of Christ. Is it not the truth that all the rivals of Christianity fail just here ?

¹ *Wit and Wisdom of Dean Inge*, 55.

All the religious philosophies of antiquity, it seems to me, shrink, in the last resort, from grasping the nettle of suffering quite firmly. They all want to make us invulnerable, somehow. There must always be a back-door of escape if the ills of life become too overpowering. Either defiant resistance, or suicide, or complete detachment, is recommended. By some means or other, the man himself must be rescued from circumstance, he must provide himself with a magic impenetrable armour. And *therefore*, the sting of pain is never drawn. The good news of Christianity is that suffering is itself divine. It is not foreign to the experience of God Himself. "In all their afflictions he was afflicted." "Surely he hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows." "If thou be the Son of God," said His enemies, "come down from the Cross." No; not while any man remains unredeemed. The divine suffering is not an episode, but a revelation. It is the necessary form which divine love takes, when it is brought into contact with evil. To overcome evil with good means to suffer unjustly and willingly.¹

Who Laughs Last?

Readers of the 'British Weekly' are familiar with the unconventional but thought-provoking, and at times provocative, articles of Quo Usque. The publication of a volume of Essays with the title *Who Laughs Last?* (3s. 6d. net) reveals the fact that Quo Usque is Mr. Frederick A. Atkins, who published not long ago 'The Durable Satisfaction of Life.' Both volumes are published by Messrs. Nisbet.

Probably the first essay—the one which gives the title to the book—is that with which there will be most general agreement. The title is taken from Mr. Galsworthy's 'Hedonist.' 'And suddenly there came before me two freaks of vision—Vaness's well-dressed person, panting, pale, perplexed; and beside him the old darkie's father, bound to the live-oak, with the bullets whistling past, and his face transfigured. There they stood alongside—the creed of pleasure . . . and the creed of love devoted unto death! "Aha," I thought; "which of the two laughs last?"'

¹ *Wit and Wisdom of Dean Inge*, 15.

The essay on War, on the other hand, is the most provocative. War is defined as 'the method adopted by the leaders of civilised nations for the settlement of disputes between governments.' But indeed there is much plain speaking in all the essays. In the essay on Labour, for example, Mr. Atkins says, 'I believe one great cause of our labour troubles is the fact that nothing has ever been offered to the workers voluntarily.' Whether we agree with Mr. Atkins or not, what he says deserves careful weighing.

Dt 3²⁴.

'Moses or not Moses—what a splendid passage, and how suggestive of the life of every man for whom religion is real or who is consecrated to a great quest or a great crusade! "Thou hast begun to shew thy servant thy greatness"—we never get beyond that, however far we go. Herrmann, in his great book, "The Communion of the Christian with God" (for which I, for one, do not cease to be grateful), says somewhere something like this: "The Christian has constantly the consciousness of being on the threshold of fresh knowledge of God." I think it is true not only in religion, but in every serious study. Ask poet or painter how he feels about Beauty; it is the same note: "Thou hast begun to shew thy servant thy greatness." I can never forget a stanza of a Keswick hymn that I once heard an old Bristol friend sing. (It is always something to have a friend's name tagged on to anything that is worth while.)

Jesus, I am resting, resting
On the joy of what Thou art;
I am finding out the greatness
Of Thy loving heart.

It seems to me an epitome of the Christian life and (if you like) of Church history. "Thou hast begun to shew thy servant."²

² T. R. Glover, *Saturday Papers*, II.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works,
and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street,
Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.